



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2013

No. 36

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 13, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY BENTIVOLIO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### SEQUESTER SHOULD APPLY TO PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about sequestration, but few have mentioned what bothers me the most about it. The pay of Members of Congress is exempted from the sequester. When Members of Congress exempt themselves from the operation of the law, it is not only unfair, it actually violates a core principle of republican government.

There is no less an authority than James Madison who will back me up on this. In *The Federalist* No. 57, he wrote:

I will add, as a fifth circumstance in the situation of the House of Representatives, restraining them from oppressive measures, that they can make no law which will not have its full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society. This has always been deemed one of the strongest bonds by which human policy can connect the rulers and the people together. It creates between them that communion of interests and sympathy of sentiments, of which few governments have furnished examples; but without which every government degenerates into tyranny. If it be asked, what is to restrain the House of Representatives from making legal discriminations in favor of themselves and a particular class of the society? I answer: the genius of the whole system; the nature of just and constitutional laws; and above all, the vigilant and manly spirit which actuates the people of America—a spirit which nourishes freedom, and in return is nourished by it.

In the spirit of James Madison, I will be filing legislation to make the sequester apply to the pay of Members of Congress at the first moment that is constitutionally permissible. Members of this body must live under the same rules as everybody else. Our Founding Fathers expected it; the American people demand it.

### OUR COUNTRY NEEDS A BALANCED PATH FORWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican budget unveiled yesterday by Chairman PAUL RYAN is a repeat of the same Tea Party principles that have already been rejected by the American people.

House Republicans are once again determined to place the burden of deficit reduction on the backs of middle class families, while the wealthiest Americans get yet another tax break. After wasting valuable time last Congress voting more than 30 times to repeal

health care reform rather than focus on jobs and the economy, the Republican budget again calls for its repeal.

In addition, their budget ends Medicare as we know it, and surprise, surprise, turns it into a voucher program that reduces benefits and leaves seniors paying higher out-of-pocket costs.

While this budget blueprint is still lacking specific details, it is clear that in order to meet the spending targets it outlines, House Republicans would slash investments in key areas that are essential to economic growth and job creation. Education, job training, science, and research will all be on the chopping block in order to reduce the deficit, with little regard for the jobs that would be lost and the impact it would have on our Nation's competitiveness. The Republican budget factors in the sequestration's arbitrary cuts over the next decade, something else that is being rejected by the American people.

For New Mexico, this can mean more cuts to education targeted at low-income and special needs children; painful cuts to tribal communities that jeopardize our responsibilities to Indian country with our trust responsibilities; and cuts that impact funding for Los Alamos National Lab and the small businesses that contract with it, including cuts to important funding for environmental cleanup at LANL.

Regardless of the Republican rhetoric, the math just doesn't add up without steep cuts that will take their toll on New Mexico, threatening services that support the most vulnerable and investments that lay the foundation for a brighter future.

Our country needs a balanced path forward that focuses on growing the economy and providing opportunities for the middle class families. Sadly, the Republican budget fails to meet this goal.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1361

# IT'S TIME TO APPROVE THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, 1,636; that's how many days it has been since the application to build the Keystone XL pipeline was filed. It took Canada just 7 months to approve the pipeline. President Obama has taken 4½ years.

Study after study has shown that not only is the pipeline safe, but it will provide a means of transporting oil that is safer than using trains or trucks. It is also environmentally safe. In fact, when compared to other means of transportation, it is perhaps the most environmentally friendly way to transport oil across our country. It will create thousands of jobs—at least 800 in my home State of Montana—and he still won't make a decision.

Earlier this month, the U.S. State Department issued its Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Presidential permit application, which confirmed what we already knew. The Keystone XL pipeline will have no significant impacts on the environment. In fact, this is the fourth environmental review of the Keystone pipeline—with a final report still to come—even though report after report has stated that the pipeline will not have significant environmental effects.

This report also comes after Nebraska Governor Dave Heineman approved a new route through his State for the Keystone XL pipeline project. Just this past January, I joined 150 other House Members in calling on President Obama to quickly approve the permits for Keystone in light of this new route. That was two months ago, and we have yet to hear anything back from the President.

As a member of the House Energy Action Team, I understand how important this project is to our Nation and to my home State of Montana. Let me be clear—this project means jobs for Montanans. This project could directly create more than 800 good-paying jobs in Montana and thousands more across the Nation.

It means coming one step closer to North American energy independence. The Keystone XL would be able to move up to 830,000 barrels of oil per day. That is about half the amount that the U.S. presently imports from the Middle East. And of the oil moved each day, 100,000 barrels will come from the Bakken formation, which spreads across Montana and North Dakota.

This isn't about politics. Republicans and Democrats alike support the pipeline. This is about our Nation's security. This is about lowering energy costs for American families. This is about American jobs.

Enough is enough. We can't afford to wait any longer. It has been 1,636 days. It's time for President Obama to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

□ 1010

# HOW ENERGY USE IMPACTS CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness of how energy use impacts climate change and to show by example what is being done about it.

Our Nation continues to rely on high-polluting energy sources that threaten our climate and threaten our national security. We need to focus at all levels of government, Federal, State, and local, as well as in the private sector to promote clean energy and energy efficiency. State and Federal facilities, above all else, should be the gold standard for clean energy and energy efficiency.

For example, the Lincoln Unified School District, located in Stockton, California, recently committed to placing solar panels on rooftops throughout the school district. Lincoln was able to purchase these solar panels through low-interest Clean Renewable Energy Bonds to help finance this project that is estimated to save \$1 million per year on energy costs. Not only does this project increase use of clean energy sources, but all the savings will be put back into educational programs, so this is truly a win-win for our students.

In addition, the University of the Pacific, also located in Stockton, California, has increased energy efficiency and sustainability. Pacific installed solar panels, energy-efficient lightbulbs in the quad and other locations, installed a robust recycling program, and installed a replacement chiller on its air-conditioning system which uses 52 percent less energy than the old chiller. It's impressive that these advancements were led by both students and faculty at the University of the Pacific.

These are just two examples of why I am introducing the Solar Energy Deployment Act. We need to encourage greater use of solar and other clean energies in our neighborhoods and on public and private lands. The Solar Energy Deployment Act awards grants on a competitive basis to State and local governments to design and install solar equipment on rooftops and above parking lots they own.

I commend the efforts made by the schools and public entities such as the Lincoln Unified School District, the University of the Pacific, and others across California and the United States that are making a concerted effort to utilize clean energy resources and to become more energy efficient.

# END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to talk about hunger in America and, specifically, the effort to end hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, hunger is still far too prevalent in America. There are more than 50 million people in this country who don't know where their next meal will come from. Seventeen million of those hungry people are children—17 million, Mr. Speaker. That breaks my heart, especially when we have a way to end hunger in this country. It doesn't have to be this way.

The truth is that hunger is solvable. We have the means, the infrastructure, and the food to end hunger. We just don't have the political will to do so.

This point is delivered in a clear, concise, and emotional way in a documentary that is in theaters now called "A Place at the Table." This film at its core may be a simple story of hunger in America, but it's really an emotional tale about how people are struggling with hunger in this country, about piecing just enough together to make ends meet day by day, week by week, and month by month.

These stories are not new and, unfortunately, they aren't unique. We don't have to look far to see a working mother who struggles to provide nutritious food for her children. We don't have to look far to see a young girl who struggles in school simply because hunger prevents her from concentrating in the classroom. We don't have to look far to see food pantries stretched beyond their means as they try to keep up with the demands of feeding the hungry in their communities. And we don't have to look far to see how often the hungry and undernourished are utilizing our health care systems for hunger and nutrition-related conditions.

What is new and unique today is the platform through which we hear these stories and experience what these individuals featured in the film are going through. The stories told by the directors, Kristi Jacobson and Lori Silverbush, weave together the heart-breaking history of how we went from almost ending hunger in America in the late 1970s, thanks in large part to the bipartisan cooperation led by Senator George McGovern and Senator Robert Dole, to now more than 50 million hungry in this country—40 years later, 50 million hungry in this country.

But this isn't just a story of woe, Mr. Speaker. For me, this is also a story of hope and optimism, a story of a difficult struggle, but a struggle fought with dignity. And it is a story that is part of a bigger purpose and goal, and that goal is to end hunger now.

At its heart, the point of this documentary is that we can end hunger now. And I'm pleased and impressed that a strong, coordinated social action plan accompanies this film.

This comprehensive plan can be found online at [www.takepart.com/table](http://www.takepart.com/table), and I encourage everyone to take a look at this Web site. Once there,

people will be able to find important resources, including ways to access food assistance if they need help; an online gallery of artists, politicians, teachers, writers, and business and community leaders who once needed help through SNAP, the primary Federal antihunger safety program that we have in this country; and also, you see a list of partners who are helping combat hunger through this film. Most importantly, it outlines ways that people can help make hunger a national priority, and it includes specific actions that people can take in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, we've had a number of strong antihunger partners over the years, but this is the first time in recent memory that there is a dedicated effort to end hunger tied directly to a mainstream film that is nationally garnering critical acclaim.

The social action plan is based on a simple concept: that people will be moved by individual stories and the facts about hunger documented in this film. When they hear the information, they will want to take action. They will be moved to act in a meaningful way.

Through this Web site, people can take part in simple actions, like contacting their elected officials or volunteering to work with local organizations that are making a difference in their communities, organizations like FRAC, Feeding America, Share Our Strength, Bread for the World, DC Central Kitchen, AmpleHarvest.org, WhyHunger, and Wholesome Wave, just to name a few of the 30 organizations allied with this film.

There is also a book, Mr. Speaker, that accompanies the film that is also of the same name, "A Place at the Table," that explains the issue of hunger and goes over the many ways that each of us can end hunger now.

As I've said over and over again, Mr. Speaker, hunger is a political condition, one that requires action by concerned Americans. Over the past few weeks, we have seen how so many Americans care about this problem and want to be part of the solution to end hunger now.

And I would, once again, Mr. Speaker, urge the President of the United States to take a leadership role, to organize a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition to devise a plan to end hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, with partners like those behind "A Place at the Table," along with their social action plan, we can make a real difference. We can end hunger now.

And it is also my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress will step up to the plate and join in the effort to end hunger now. It is our moral obligation. It is the right thing to do. Now is the time.

## "RYANOMICS"—THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, "Ryanomics," the House Republican budget, the so-called path to prosperity, is based upon a fanciful theory of trickle-down economics. This is a well-worn idea that belies the facts that we've seen proven time and time again.

That truth is that giving tax breaks and hollowing out the Tax Code with loopholes for the wealthy, while cutting spending for the social safety net and the poor, while cutting everything else that makes America great, that somehow this is going to create prosperity for all. Indeed, the Republicans have played from this same playbook before, and it has failed.

□ 1020

It has failed again, and it continues to fail. This was an economic theory first proposed by the American hero, Ronald Reagan. They called it Reaganomics. Trickle-down economics is what they liked to say: it would trickle down to the poor. George Herbert Walker Bush called it "voodoo economics." I think he was right on with that because in practicing voodoo, they just ask you to believe. And that's what Ryanomics is proposing for us to do. The numbers just don't add up.

Today, we only have to look at Europe to see the terrible effects of severe austerity. The Republican prescription of cut, cut, cut has been tried, tried, tried repeatedly across Europe and has only exacerbated the problems over there. Now, under the guise of balancing the budget in 10 years, we've got Ryanomics II, or Turbo Ryanomics. They're going to take \$15 trillion and balance the budget in 10 years, doubling down on a theory that Americans rejected just last year. Four or 5 months ago, we rejected Ryanomics; but here we have Ryanomics II, or Turbo Ryanomics.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not here to solely criticize the path that Republicans have charted for this House with their budget priorities. In fact, I agree with them that Congress must make difficult choices about future spending. The problem is that all too often this body asks very little of the rich and the powerful, handing out tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires like candy, doing this at the expense of the middle class and the poor. You have seen the income disparity between the top 2 percent and the middle class. The gap continues to widen.

Shared sacrifice should truly be that. It should be something that all Americans share in. Why does Congress continue to give tax breaks to big corporations that outsource jobs but fail to invest in education and scientific research that would help the American economy by creating jobs and reducing unemployment? Why would they con-

tinue to give tax breaks to those who don't need them, rather than educating the next generation of workers so that this country can continue to compete and be at the top of the global economy?

Despite the fact that trickle-down economics has been roundly criticized and discredited, my colleagues across the aisle choose to double down on what hasn't worked, and they want to continue to relentlessly cut, cut, cut the programs and the services that Americans depend on every day and which help drive our economy. I believe we must reduce our debt—and we must do that in a responsible and sensible way that slows spending over time. We can no longer leave working Americans behind while we allow the wealthy to walk away with the largest share of national prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the CPC, the CBC, and the Democratic budgets that keep our promises and invest in what works to grow the middle class.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 24 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all who call upon Your name. Send Your Spirit to fill their hearts with those divine gifts You have prepared for them.

May Your grace find expression in their compassion for the weak and the poor among us, and may Your mercy encourage goodwill in all they do and accomplish this day.

As the Members of the people's House face the demands of our time, grant them and us all Your peace and strength, that we might act justly, love tenderly, and walk humbly with You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COFFMAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### SELECTIVE SERVICE

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1972, I volunteered to serve in the United States Army at a time when young men were still being drafted into our military. The last draftees were inducted into the United States Army in 1973, and 2 years later, given the success of the all-volunteer Army, the requirement for young men to register with Selective Service ended.

In a symbolic show of strength to the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, President Jimmy Carter asked Congress to reinstate the Selective Service System in 1980. Congress did so, and to this day all males are required by law to register with the Selective Service System within 30 days of their 18th birthday. However, despite the first gulf war, and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, conscription has never been considered as a viable option by our military.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 978, will end the registration requirement and dismantle the outdated Selective Service bureaucracy—saving the taxpayers over \$24 million a year—and I urge its adoption.

#### GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo River is identified by the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative as one of 43 areas of concern in the Great Lakes watershed. In 2011, a coalition of corporate and community partners teamed up with State and local governments to begin a multimillion-dollar cleanup of the Buffalo River. Unfortunately, sequestration and uncertainty about a new Federal budget threaten to delay this project.

Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are a unique national treasure with global significance. They are the largest source of surface freshwater on Earth, containing 20 percent of the world's supply. They contain 95 percent of America's freshwater, and they support 1.5 million jobs and \$62 billion in wages in the shipping, recreation, and fishing industries.

Preservation of our Great Lakes has both environmental and economic impacts and has always enjoyed bipartisan support. We cannot afford to allow sequestration to halt critical projects like the Buffalo River cleanup. I urge my colleagues to repeal the sequester and protect funding for the Great Lakes restoration.

#### REFUNDABLE CHILD TAX CREDIT

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year, billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars are wasted due to abuse of the \$1,000 refundable child tax credit. Instead of hitting up taxpayers for even more taxes, Washington needs to go after these billions of dollars that are fraudulently wasted.

It's time to end this sham. That's why I have reintroduced commonsense legislation, H.R. 556, that stops this abuse by requiring tax filers to provide their Social Security number in order to receive this tax credit, just like we do for the Earned Income Tax Credit.

Congress' nonpartisan tax scorekeeper, the Joint Committee on Taxation, has found that my bill would save taxpayers an estimated \$24.4 billion over the next 10 years. With the dire need to get our fiscal house in order, this simple, commonsense fix can go a long way toward protecting precious taxpayer dollars by stamping out waste, fraud, and abuse. It's time to get this done.

#### RYAN BUDGET

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the House Budget Committee, I understand well the challenges of budgeting for our Nation's future. Unfortunately, the budget introduced by House Republicans this week fails at its most fundamental tasks: protecting the middle class and laying

the groundwork for strong economic growth.

As it has for the last 2 years, the Ryan budget once again makes deep cuts to Medicare, as it also repeals a host of Federal measures making health insurance affordable for middle class families. It replaces the security of Medicare with a voucher that will lose its value over time—driving many middle class seniors into poverty—and makes deep cuts to education, transportation and infrastructure, and public health and safety, gutting society's basic functions without which businesses can't find educated workers, move their products to market, or operate safely.

Voters roundly rejected this approach only a few months ago. I call on my colleagues to reject this budget and join me in supporting a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

□ 1210

#### COAL

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I was recently visiting with my constituents in Nicholas County, Kentucky, when I learned about the latest casualty in the Obama administration's war on coal. Joy Global, a manufacturer of underground mining equipment, operates a plant in neighboring Bourbon County. The news had just broken that Joy Global plans to cease all operations and manufacturing at that plant. The story of Joy Global is timely in light of President Obama's nomination of Gina McCarthy to lead the Environmental Protection Agency.

I wish those who are responsible for the war on coal could have been with me that Friday morning. It's easy to sit in Washington and issue regulations when you don't have to confront the human cost.

The Obama administration's war on coal cost more than 3,000 well-paying coal miner jobs in Kentucky last year. Thousands of families potentially went from healthy incomes to food stamps. But this administration doesn't appear to care.

The coal industry supports 19,000 full-time jobs in Kentucky while providing our State with the Nation's fourth lowest utility rates. Mr. Speaker, it's time the administration put people ahead of its radical agenda.

#### OPPOSING THE CLOSING OF THE IRVINGTON, TEXAS, POST OFFICE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my frustration and disappointment with the Postal Service's decision to close the Irvington Station Post Office that

serves ZIP Code 77022 in Houston, Texas, on April 30.

This post office is highly valued in our district and has served residents of the Northside area in Houston for 50 years. The Postal Service announced that the Irvington office would be demolished, despite the fact that the agency has failed to ensure that local residents will still have access to essential mail services.

The Irvington office's lease is expiring, and instead of finding a new location nearby or moving retail operations into the Northline Commons area as a compromise, the Postal Service has chosen to close the office. I contacted and met with postal officials without success.

Moving forward with the closure is irresponsible and undermines the integrity of the agency. The people living in and around the 77022 ZIP Code will not have the same access to postal services as everyone else.

I understand the Postal Service's budget constraints and support reforming the agency. However, maintaining a presence in the area makes smart business sense for the Postal Service and fulfills a need in this revitalized community. The post office is losing customers and friends in this effort.

#### THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans and Congressman RYAN released their budget, which, unfortunately, once again seeks to balance the budget on the backs of seniors, the middle class, and the most vulnerable among us. The GOP budget presents the same failed policies that Americans rejected last fall.

This budget is full of false realities, fuzzy math, and the wrong priorities. Instead of closing the corporate jet loophole, the Republican budget ends Medicare as we know it, turning health care for seniors into a voucher program. Instead of ending billions in tax subsidies for Big Oil, the Republican budget slashes Medicaid for the most vulnerable among us, turning it into a block grant program. And instead of asking the wealthiest among us to pay their fair share, it wants to kick millions of people off health care plans by repealing the Affordable Care Act—well, actually, repealing the parts of the Affordable Care Act that provide care for people but somehow preserving the cost savings and the revenues that it delivers.

Instead of targeting the most vulnerable communities and placing the burden entirely on the middle class, Republicans should work with Democrats to put in place a balanced and bipartisan budget that puts Americans back to work.

#### SEQUESTRATION AND MILITARY PERSONNEL

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring light to one of the many overlooked effects of sequestration. I just came from a Military Personnel hearing where the Services had an opportunity to speak frankly about how these cuts will affect them. Some of the worst impacts will come as a result of civilian furloughs.

Fifty-two percent of military behavioral health specialists are civilians, and those civilians will be furloughed, as will 62 of the specialists who work for the Marine Corps' Wounded Warrior unit. These specialists provide a vital service to our injured servicemembers. So how can Congress continue to treat the work of these and other Federal employees in what is perceived as a very callous manner?

Mr. Speaker, we have asked our men and women in uniform to sacrifice so much. How can we possibly ask them to sacrifice even more? We must come together to solve sequestration before these devastating cuts become irreversible.

#### 125TH ANNIVERSARY FOR THE CITY OF ORANGE

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, the city of Orange, California, will celebrate its 125th anniversary. As the third oldest city in Orange County, the city of Orange is a big city but with a small town feel.

Orange is home to notable attractions like the Plaza at Orange, the Outlets at Orange, the UCI Medical Center, the Children's Hospital of Orange County, and my alma mater, Chapman University.

This milestone will be celebrated in Old Towne Orange, and it will commemorate the families, the residents, and the businesses that have made the city what it is today.

Congratulations to the city and residents of Orange on this incredible occasion. I am proud to represent the city of Orange and the 46th Congressional District of California. Happy 125th anniversary, city of Orange.

#### TANF AUTHORIZATION

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, Republicans say the darnedest things. I'd like to read a statement from a 2005 letter from the Republican Governors Association outlining its priorities for TANF reauthorization:

As Governors, we believe the following provisions . . . are integral to State programs and support their inclusion and protection as the bill moves forward through regular order.

The [2005] Senate bill provides States with the flexibility to manage their TANF programs. . . . Increased waiver authority . . . and the ability to coordinate State programs are all important aspects of moving recipients from welfare to work.

The letter was signed by Mitt Romney, Jeb Bush, Mike Huckabee, Mitch Daniels, Rick Perry, and many more.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House debates banning the very waivers that Republican leaders from across the country have already expressed their support for. Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to listen to Republican Governors and allow States to find new and creative models to move people from welfare to work.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 13, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 13, 2013 at 10:41 a.m.:

Appointments: Senate National Security Working Group.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 890, PRESERVING THE WELFARE WORK REQUIREMENT AND TANF EXTENSION ACT OF 2013

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 107 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 107

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 890) to prohibit waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-3 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Worcester (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 890, the Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013.

□ 1220

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

It was not the intention of the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, to have a closed rule. However, the committee received only four amendments, one of which was withdrawn. The remaining three amendments were all subject to points of order for germaneness and other violations of the rules of the House. Unfortunately, we are left with little choice but to propose a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 890 would prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from issuing waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for welfare recipients, which were created under the historic 1996 welfare reform law. These work requirements have led to more work, more earning, less welfare dependence, and less poverty among low-income Americans.

Additionally, H.R. 890 incorporates the text of H.R. 987. H.R. 987 extends the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families programs, also known as TANF, which is due to expire on March 27, through the end of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, the Welfare and Medicaid Reform Act of 1996 made historic changes in the way our country treats its most impoverished citizens. Generally, the reforms offered States new flexibility in designing welfare programs. However, in exchange for that flexibility, strong new Federal work requirements were put in place. These requirements specified the minimum number of hours per week an individual must engage in either work or work-related activities and penalties for failure to comply.

What were the results of the 1996 reforms? Well, let me just go over a few.

America saw the greatest reduction in poverty among children since the 1960s. The employment rate for single mothers in 2010 is higher than it was in 1996, even though the unemployment rate itself has almost doubled during that period of time. Poverty among single mothers has fallen by 30 percent. The list of successes associated with the law, which I must stress was bipartisan and worked upon by both parties both in this Chamber and obviously by President Clinton, goes on and on.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Welfare Reform Act specifically prohibited waivers of the new TANF work requirements. Under both Republican and Democratic administrations, it's been assumed that these requirements could not be waived. However, the current administration, through a so-called "informational memorandum"—I'm frankly not quite sure what that is—has decided it does have the authority to waive these work requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan compromise that was drafted in 1996 has done a good job in reducing poverty in this country and improving the lives and the prospects of those mired in very difficult circumstances. We should not allow the administration to undo, by an informational memorandum, what the Congress and Presidents in the past have been able to accomplish by statute.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and a good rule. I urge the support of the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would tell my colleagues that this is not a good rule. It is a closed rule, and there's no need for it.

This prevents Members of the House of both parties from coming to the floor with ideas or ways to amend this legislation. Because of the rule, they're prevented from doing so. I think that is an unfortunate fact. We should have deliberation on this House floor. Given the fact that we're not doing much of anything, we certainly have the time to deliberate, and I would hope that in the future that we would see more flexibility on the rules and less closed rules. So I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule because of that.

Mr. Speaker, once again the Republican majority in the House is proving that they never let facts get in the way of a good press release.

Today's bill takes a sensible, bipartisan piece of legislation and tacks on a partisan political ploy that was used in the last Congress to try to embarrass President Obama.

Instead of bringing a simple, clean extension of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, the Re-

publican majority is continuing a political attack from the last election. And like many of the other political attacks lobbed against President Obama in that campaign, this attack is simply untrue and destined for failure.

Over the last 2 years, members of the majority have charged that actions taken by the Department of Health and Human Services to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the TANF program are an attempt to "let people sit at home and collect welfare checks."

Such charges have been declared false by numerous fact check organizations, including Factcheck.org, PolitiFact, and The Fact Checker at The Washington Post.

Furthermore, Ron Haskins, the former Republican staff director of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee and one of the chief architects of the 1996 welfare reform law, said the reforms similar to the ones being made by HHS are justified. And he added:

I do not think it ends welfare reform or strongly undermines welfare reform. Each State has to say what they will do and how that reform will either increase employment or lead to better employment.

That's Ron Haskins, the former Republican staff director of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, the merits of the changes implemented by HHS strengthen Federal efforts to move Americans from welfare to work. In allowing States the flexibility from rigid TANF requirements, the administration requires that any changes provide a more efficient or effective means to promote employment. In explaining the policy changes, HHS Secretary Sebelius stated:

Governors must commit that their proposals will move at least 20 percent more people from welfare to work compared to the State's past performance.

Under such requirements, it is impossible to assert that these changes will weaken the Federal efforts to move citizens from welfare to work. In fact, in looking at the actual rules even briefly, it is clear that these changes strengthen our Federal efforts by allowing for more effective and more efficient programs by giving them room to operate at the State level.

Mr. Speaker, it may be surprising to some watching today's proceedings that the majority disapproves of the administration's programmatic changes. The underlying principle of the changes is the belief that States should have flexibility to implement proven and effective methods for moving Americans from welfare to work.

Yet today, a Republican majority that often boasts of its commitment to States' rights now stands in fierce opposition to that very principle. They find themselves demanding that even when more effective methods for putting Americans to work are available, Federal standards dictated from Washington must rule the day.

And the real irony in their argument against the administration's action is that the request for flexibility came from a Governor, a Republican Governor. And it was not just a Republican Governor from a blue State like New Jersey or a purple State like Virginia. No, Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Utah—one of the reddest States in the Nation—is the one that has requested this waiver.

I've seen some interesting legislative jujitsu on this House floor. One day they're adhering to the Hastert rule, and the next day the Boehner rule applies. This Republican majority legislates by lurching from one issue to another issue trying to find something that works.

So I can't say that I'm surprised that they're declaring themselves against increasing work requirements for TANF recipients as requested by a Republican Governor. The only thing I can chalk it up to is politics. You'd think that at some point the Republican majority would rather legislate instead of fighting a political battle that was decided 4 months ago, a political battle that they lost badly. Sadly, that day is not today.

If this majority were truly serious about work and employment, about actually reducing the number of people on TANF, then we would be voting on a bill to repeal the sequester and we would be voting on a bill to save the 750,000 jobs that will be lost this year because of these arbitrary, mindless, senseless, and thoughtless cuts.

The reauthorization of TANF in and of itself is not controversial. We can move that bill on suspension. What appears to be controversial to this Republican leadership is putting people back to work. What appears to be controversial to this Republican leadership is saving our economy from the devastating sequester cuts. What appears to be controversial to this Republican leadership is responsible governing.

In contrast, Mr. Speaker, House Democrats have a plan that House Republicans block time after time after time to avoid sequester.

Congressman VAN HOLLEN has a balanced sequester replacement, one that will get rid of the arbitrary cuts and replace them with a balanced mix of cuts and revenues, revenues that come from closing tax loopholes that even Republicans like Mitt Romney thought we should eliminate.

Congressman VAN HOLLEN has come to the Rules Committee four times this year alone in the hope that this Republican leadership, the ones who promised an open House and an open legislative process, would make his amendment in order. And four times now, the Republican leadership in this House has refused to make that amendment in order.

□ 1230

Why, Mr. Speaker? Why? Why not allow the Van Hollen sequester replacement bill to come to the floor for a

vote? Didn't Speaker BOEHNER promise a more open House? Didn't he say that the House should work its will?

Mr. Speaker, this is not a way to run a democracy. This is not an open and fair process.

That's because this Republican leadership is not about openness. They're not about legislating responsibly. They're about desperate attempts to score cheap political points. That's what they're doing with the sequester. And that's what they're doing with this TANF reauthorization—something that should be totally noncontroversial, something that should be approved with an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat this closed rule, an unnecessarily closed rule, and defeat this bill. It is time we put partisan politics aside, at least until the next election season begins, and start working for the American people.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It was once famously observed that the inhabitants of the United Kingdom and the United States were two people divided by the same language. Evidently, that applies to the people of Massachusetts and the people of Oklahoma.

I want to thank my good friend, who kindly sent me a note. I had mentioned if you're from Oklahoma, we would say he's from Worcester, but he said it's "Worcest-ah." So I want to get that right, and I want to thank my friend for correcting me. That's probably the only place my friend and I will agree, and I'll agree that it was appropriate to correct me.

Let me just make a couple of simple responses to what my friend had to say. I don't want to re-debate sequester. He and I had an opportunity to do that in the context of the continuing resolution last week. But the idea that that was somehow partisan, when over 50 of my friends' colleagues voted for it on final passage, strikes me as odd. It was, actually, quite bipartisan, and we began a process in that that is going to result in saving the American people \$1.2 trillion.

We think we made initial steps in improving the bill. It appears to us as if that same process is working now on the other side of the rotunda amongst our friends in the Senate, and so we're working our way towards a responsible piece of legislation, operating through regular order and trying to find common ground.

We're not happy with the sequester. We tried to fix it a couple of times, as my friend recalls. Neither the Senate nor the President ever took us up on that offer, so we worked hard. Now we found another route. Perhaps we can keep working and find some common ground in some other areas.

As to this bill itself, let's just go back to the specifics. All we're doing is

making sure that the work requirement stays in place. I'll make a rather bold prediction and say after the rule vote is over, probably a lot of Democrats will vote for that legislation.

They'll vote for it for two reasons:

First, it reauthorizes TANF, which is a good thing. We agree on that. It's a good piece of legislation. And certainly we should provide the neediest of our people certainty through the end of the fiscal year, as opposed to the end of March. So I think that's an effort by both sides to do the right thing.

But second, if there's a misunderstanding here and we misinterpreted the administration, fair enough. I don't think we did, but regardless, let's just make absolutely sure and pass this legislation. If we both agree on it, it shouldn't be a point of a great deal of contention.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for his improved pronunciation. I appreciate that. And I also appreciate the spirit of bipartisanship that he has displayed on a number of issues, most recently on the Violence Against Women Act.

I kind of wish that that same spirit was brought to this bill here today, this TANF bill, because it would pass overwhelmingly.

Just so that there's no confusion about what HHS is trying to do, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter that Kathleen Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, sent to the Honorable DAVE CAMP, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, which explains how the administration views this flexibility that they might at some point utilize. But basically it is not to weaken the work requirement; it is to support States that have better ideas to improve the results to get more people to work.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I would say is that, again, it's ironic that my friends on the other side have kind of chosen to put a little bit of politics into this debate given the fact that a Republican Governor from a red State, Utah, suggests to the administration that he might have a better idea on how his State might get better results in putting more people to work, getting people off of public assistance and into the workforce.

I think that's a good thing. I think what all of us believe is whatever it takes to get more people into the workforce is a good thing.

I would also say to my friend—he mentioned that the Republicans have had proposals to deal with the sequester. Not in this session they haven't. Not a single time in this current Congress have my Republican friends brought an alternative to the floor to avoid sequester—these arbitrary, mindless, senseless cuts that go across the board.



If you had a line item in the budget that said “fraud, waste, and abuse,” under the sequester that would be treated the same way as a line item for medical research or for education or for transportation and infrastructure. This is not a way to deal with our budgetary challenges.

The reason why I bring up sequester today is because I wish there were a greater sense of urgency in this House of Representatives to deal with it. We’re all talking about welfare-to-work right now. But by allowing the sequester to continue to go into place, CBO tells us that we’re going to risk 750,000 jobs; 750,000 of our fellow citizens will be out of work because of the inaction of this Congress.

I find that unacceptable. We ought to be preserving jobs, we ought to be expanding jobs, we ought to be doing everything we can to get people back to work because that’s the surest way to reduce our deficit. The more people working, the more revenues, the more we can pay down our deficit.

We should be talking about trying to get our budgetary House in order without diminishing the quality of life and the standard of living for people in this country.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, July 18, 2012.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for your interest in the guidance we have released to states concerning the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program.

The 1996 welfare reform legislation established work requirements which have been critical to moving people off welfare and into jobs. The proposal we have outlined strengthens the law’s purpose to move people off of welfare and into jobs by utilizing state-based innovation. Our goal is to accelerate job placement by moving more Americans from welfare to work, and no policy which undercuts that goal or waters down work requirements will be considered or approved by the Department.

For years, Republican and Democratic Governors have requested more flexibility in implementing welfare reform so they can meet their states’ specific needs. In 2005, 29 Republican Governors requested “[i]ncreased waiver authority, allowable work activities, availability of partial work credit” so they might more “effectively serve low-income” Americans. Certain elements of the proposal endorsed by the 2005 Republican Governors were very far-reaching and would not be approved under the Department’s proposed waivers. More recently, Utah and Nevada requested waiver opportunities. While it appears some of the policies enumerated in the letters would not be eligible for waivers under our policy, we look forward to receiving and being able to consider a formal application from these and other states. The Department is providing a very limited waiver opportunity for states that develop a plan to measurably increase the number of beneficiaries who find and hold down a job. Specifically, Governors must commit that their proposals will move at least 20% more people from welfare to work compared to the state’s past performance. States must also demonstrate clear progress toward that goal no later than one year after their programs

take effect. If they fail, their waiver will be rescinded. And if a Governor proposes a plan that undercuts the work requirements established in welfare reform, that plan will be rejected.

We will follow our initial guidance to states with further information detailing metrics and accountability measures. The policy we have outlined is designed to accelerate job placement rates for those on welfare, not address other aspects of their lives. No plan that undercuts the goal of moving people from welfare to work will be considered or approved. For example, the Department will not approve a waiver that changes the definition of work requirements to include any of the activities outlined in a 2005 GAO report on TANF such as personal care activities, massage, and journaling. We will continue to hold states accountable for moving people from welfare to work.

#### STRENGTHENING WELFARE REFORM THROUGH STATE-BASED INNOVATION

For states, welfare can too often be a maze of red tape and nonsensical rules. For example, states can get more credit for assigning people to do job search than for placing them into paying, private-sector jobs. The rules not only place an administrative burden on states, but make searching for a job and securing employment more difficult for families. The proposal we have outlined gives states flexibility to cut red tape and get people back to work.

As noted earlier, when Congress considered legislation reauthorizing the TANF program in 2005, Governors from across the country also expressed their support for more flexibility for states in the TANF program. In a letter to Congress, the following Governors specifically endorsed Senate legislation, which would have allowed many states to receive waivers far broader than we are allowing now—including, for example, waivers of the time limits in the 1996 welfare reform law. Governors signing this letter included:

Bob Riley, Alabama; Frank H. Murkowski, Alaska; Mike Huckabee, Arkansas; Arnold Schwarzenegger, California; Bill Owens, Colorado; M. Jodi Rell, Connecticut; Jeb Bush, Florida; Sonny Perdue, Georgia; Linda Lingle, Hawaii; Dirk Kempthorne, Idaho; Mitch Daniels, Indiana; Ernie Fletcher, Kentucky; Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr., Maryland; Mitt Romney, Massachusetts.

Tim Pawlenty, Minnesota; Haley Barbour, Mississippi; Matt Blunt, Missouri; Dave Heineman, Nebraska; George E. Pataki, New York; Kenny C. Guinn, Nevada; John Hoeven, North Dakota; Bob Taft, Ohio; Donald L. Carcieri, Rhode Island; Mark Sanford, South Carolina; M. Michael Rounds, South Dakota; Rick Perry, Texas; Jon Huntsman, Jr., Utah; James Douglas, Vermont.

As also noted previously, we do not go as far as these Governors in supporting state flexibility. Within limits, however, we agree with their letter that states should have “the flexibility to manage their TANF programs and effectively serve low-income populations.” If a Governor commits to a plan to strengthen work requirements that moves more people from welfare to work, we welcome the opportunity to review that proposal. On the other hand, if a Governor is satisfied with the status quo, the state will not be required to submit a waiver request and can continue to operate under the current welfare system.

We do not have to choose between providing temporary assistance to families who fall on hard times and putting people back to work. We can do both by strengthening work requirements so more people move from welfare to work and giving states flexibility to tailor their welfare reforms to their specific needs. But while we continue to explore new

ways to strengthen work requirements, we will not accept any changes that undercut employment-focused welfare reforms that were signed into law fifteen years ago.

As we have relayed to your staff, we would welcome the opportunity to brief them on the legal and programmatic issues related to this policy and to discuss the feedback we have received from states about the challenges that the current requirements present to creating jobs. Attached is a more detailed description of HHS’ waiver authority under current law. I will also provide this response to Senator Hatch.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN SEBELIUS.

Enclosure.

#### ATTACHMENT—LEGAL BASIS FOR UTILIZING WAIVER AUTHORITY IN TANF

The exercise of waiver authority contemplated in the July 12 Information Memorandum is clearly authorized by section 1115(a)(1) of the Social Security Act. Section 1115(a)(1) allows the Secretary to “waive compliance with any of the requirements of section . . . 402 [of the Act] . . . to the extent and for the period [s]he finds necessary to enable [a] State . . . to carry out” an approved experimental, pilot, or demonstration project that will assist in promoting the objectives of the TANF program. 42 U.S.C. § 1315(a)(1). As the Information Memorandum explains, section 402 sets forth state plan requirements for the TANF program, including the requirement that a plan “[e]nsure that parents and caretakers receiving assistance under the program engage in work activities in accordance with section 407.” *Id.* § 602(a)(1)(A)(iii). By authorizing the Secretary to “waive compliance with any of the requirements of section . . . 402,” therefore, section 1115 permits the Secretary to waive the requirements of section 407 when she determines that a waiver would promote the objectives of the TANF program and satisfy the other prerequisites for a waiver.

Your letter maintains that the Secretary’s section 1115 waiver authority does not extend to the requirements described in the Information Memorandum because those requirements are set forth in section 407 rather than section 402. But, as explained above, the plain text of section 402 incorporates the requirements of section 407 by reference. Moreover, the Department has long interpreted its authority to waive state plan requirements under section 1115 to extend to requirements set forth in other statutory provisions that are referenced in the provisions governing state plans. This interpretation has been consistently applied throughout the history of section 1115, including in the context of the Medicaid, child support, and former Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) programs. For example, in Wisconsin’s well-known “Work Not Welfare” demonstration implemented in 1995, the state received a waiver of rules related to the distribution of child support. While section 1115 references the child support state plan provisions in section 454, the child support rules waived in the Wisconsin waiver are in section 457, but included by reference in the state plan in section 454(11). (Additional examples can be provided upon request.) If Congress had intended to restrict the Secretary’s waiver authority when it replaced the AFDC program with the TANF program in 1996, it could have deleted section 1115’s reference to section 402 or otherwise indicated its intent to depart from past practice. Congress did not do so and the Department is adhering to its longstanding interpretation that section 1115 waiver authority extends to requirements incorporated by reference into the state plan sections of programs, including Medicaid, child support, and TANF.



Your letter also claims that section 415(a)(2)(B) of the Act precludes the Secretary from waiving section 407's requirements. But section 415(a)(2)(B) has no application here because it is a transitional provision applicable only to waivers under the former AFDC program, which was replaced by the TANF program in 1996. Indeed, the plain language of section 415(a)(2)(B) makes clear that it is limited to waivers that related to "a State program funded under this part (as in effect on September 30, 1996)"—that is, under the former AFDC program. 42 U.S.C. §615(a)(2)(B) (emphasis added). That provision thus does nothing to restrict the Secretary's waiver authority with respect to the current TANF program.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes at this time to the gentleman from Puerto Rico, my good friend, Mr. PIERLUISI.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, although I strongly support the TANF program, which provides payments to low-income families with children, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. Yesterday, I filed the budget-neutral amendment to H.R. 890. However, the Rules Committee reported a closed rule, thereby foreclosing debate, and a vote, on my amendment.

My amendment sought to eliminate disparities that the territories face under TANF. Under current law, the territories are not eligible for TANF supplemental grants, contingency funds, and mandatory child care funds.

Moreover, Federal law imposes an annual cap on the overall funding that each of the territories can receive under a variety of public assistance programs, including TANF. I have introduced legislation to repeal this funding cap, which has not been increased since 1996, and to make the territories eligible for TANF grants they do not presently receive. The amendment I filed yesterday was rooted in this legislation but modified to comply with PAYGO rules.

Those who seek evidence of how Puerto Rico is hurt by its territory status need look no further than the unequal treatment my constituents receive under TANF and other safety-net programs. These programs are designed to help our Nation's most vulnerable residents, none of whom—I must emphasize—earn enough to pay Federal income taxes.

This treatment would be unprincipled under any circumstances, but it is particularly unfair when one considers that, last November, voters in Puerto Rico rejected the current status and expressed a desire for statehood, a status that would entitle them to equal treatment under all Federal laws. If Congress elects to undertake a comprehensive reauthorization of the TANF program, I hope my colleagues will work with me to eliminate the disparities that Puerto Rico faces under current law, especially in light of the fact that my constituents have rejected the political status that allows for such unequal treatment.

□ 1240

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to quickly respond to my friend's point on sequester again. A little bit like Lucy and the football, we've tried this twice, and the idea that we should now have to tee it up a third time before the President rouses himself—or the Senate—to action, strikes me as a little bit extreme. Again, we've tried to do it. We're now moving through another process. It seems to be working. Regular order seems to actually be working around here, and I'm hopeful we'll get to, before the end of the month, a resolution that will be considerably better than the CR, that will frankly have folded a lot of the work of the Appropriations Committee into what is effectively the fiscal year 2013 budget.

To my friend from Puerto Rico, it is my understanding—and I'm not a parliamentarian—that the amendment was not germane or was ruled out of order to the bill. Again, I'm not and don't pretend to be an expert on that, but I think he makes an excellent point, and it is certainly a matter worthy of consideration at some appropriate time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we don't have a great deal of disagreement here. Let's just make sure that the work requirement is there. There is considerable debate as to who asked for waivers, whether they were asked for, and whether it was reform. I've seen a lot of back-and-forth on this, and I don't pretend to know; but I think it's the clear intent of this Chamber, and always has been since the legislation was passed, that the work requirements remain intact. So just reiterating that point I think makes it crystal clear to everyone and perhaps eliminates the confusion.

Again, I think the reauthorization of the underlying legislation is something that both parties want to accomplish and want to provide certainty for people that are in very difficult circumstances that they're not going to be at risk financially if for some reason, which I don't anticipate, we actually don't get our work done by March 27 and avoid some sort of catastrophic government shutdown. Again, something that I know the President wants to do and something that my friends on the other side of the aisle want to do and something I think our colleagues in the United States Senate want to do.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to address a couple of points of my colleague from Oklahoma, whom I have a great deal of respect for.

First of all, if we had an open rule, Mr. PIERLUISI could have had a chance to offer his amendment, and we could get a judgment from the Parliamentarian then. Secondly, also the Rules Committee could have waived the ger-

maneness rule to allow Mr. PIERLUISI to have his amendment made in order. So the Rules Committee could have done that, and chose instead to report a closed rule here so that nobody can offer anything. It is completely closed, a closed process.

Secondly, with regard to sequestration again, I point out that the President of the United States did offer a grand bargain. My Republican friends said no to that. He put a lot of different things on the table trying to come up with a grand bargain to deal with our deficit but also not undercut our economy. It was a balance of cuts and revenue, but my Republican friends said no to that.

And I would repeat again, in this Congress, the House Republicans have done nothing, have proposed zero to be able to avoid the sequester. There have been no alternatives brought before the Rules Committee, nothing brought to the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN has, on four different occasions, tried to avoid sequester with a very balanced approach, and it would save 750,000 jobs. If there's anything that's urgent in this Chamber, it should be to preserve and protect the 750,000 jobs that will be lost because of these sequester cuts.

I would finally say that the United States Senate, far from a perfect branch of government in my opinion, but nonetheless, the Senate Majority Leader had an alternative to sequester that got 51 votes. That's a majority. But, unfortunately, under the Senate rules and with Republican insistence that they needed 60 votes, it didn't make it. But 51 Senators voted for an alternative.

So there are alternatives out there; and the notion that we should kind of sit back, lay back, and maybe something will emerge miraculously to deal with this issue I don't think is the proper role of the House of Representatives. We ought to be deliberating and debating and finding ways to protect those 750,000 jobs.

We talk about welfare to work here. And again, the irony is we're trying to prevent the administration from being able to have the flexibility to be able to work with States who want to get better results, to get more people off of welfare to work. But when you talk about getting people to work, we ought to also be talking about preserving the 750,000 jobs that will be lost because of our inaction on sequester.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as we continue very important efforts to strengthen the middle class in America, I think it's important to recognize that there are millions of Americans who would like to be part of it, who are struggling at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder hoping to work their way into the middle class. I think

that's where our focus should be, because in recent decades, we've seen growing economic inequality in this country where a few have so much and many have so very little.

One of the goals of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, or TANF, initiative back in 1996 was to help those who wanted to climb the economic ladder. In hopes of accomplishing that, and valuing personally the importance of work, I voted for welfare reform. And if you evaluate it based on how many poor people it's denied assistance to, it's a great success. If, on the other hand, you evaluate it based on how many poor people it has helped to secure good, livable wages in long-term jobs, its success, at best, is very spotty.

Today's debate ought to be about how do we strengthen the effectiveness of TANF and related programs to assist more people in working their way into the middle class. But instead of focusing on lifting people up, like the previous temporary extension of TANF, this Republican effort is really about putting them down. It's about suggesting that the stereotype of the welfare Cadillac, of the aimless and the shiftless who don't want to work is real. Instead of a vision about an effective, long-term reauthorization of welfare to work, this bill represents the third time that Republicans have insisted on just a temporary, short-term extension of the same old programs.

The last time that we did this, Republicans included a firm prohibition and strong rhetoric about denying anyone using their electronic benefits at strip clubs or casinos. Who could object to that? But it's hardly central to how we advance these individuals who want to work.

This time it's the leftover Presidential campaign ploy arguing that the administration wanted to encourage more welfare loafing and idleness by weakening work requirements. Neither this bill nor its predecessors were truly about helping more people to secure jobs. They're about reinforcing the prejudice that many poor people are takers, not makers; that they're just eager to take somebody else's tax money and loaf.

Well, I believe that today's attempt to restrict State authority to strengthen welfare-to-work initiatives also totally contradicts what is happening at this very moment with a blockheaded Republican budget that would block-grant almost unbridled authority to the States to weaken health care. Because of the way that the TANF program is currently structured, whether this rule and this bill are approved is largely irrelevant to 99 percent of the working-age poor people in America today who are not currently participating in any of the TANF work activities.

I think we should do better by these folks. They want to become part of the middle class, but they find themselves in no job or a dead-end job. Instead of

focusing on denying assistance to as many people as possible, we ought to be engaging in constructive, bipartisan discussion about what are the best ways to make the program effective to lift people up. Instead of focusing on waivers and simply waving good-bye to the many people in America who are economically disadvantaged and want a better opportunity, who want some hope to get out of poverty, let's try to do more to assist those people in more productive, long-term programs.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1250

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire of the gentleman from Oklahoma whether he has any additional speakers.

Mr. COLE. I'm prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the gentleman, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this closed rule. Again, I regret very much that something that really should be truly bipartisan and totally bipartisan and totally noncontroversial has now become politicized so that there's division.

Again, I wish that we had followed the same path we did with the Violence Against Women Act, when a more controversial and divisive attempt on that bill was put aside for something that was more of a consensus and had broad bipartisan support. We could do the same thing here, and I wish we would.

There is no need for this bill to become politicized; and my guess is that when it comes back to the House, the controversial provisions that we are complaining about right now will probably be gone.

Mr. Speaker, we just had a long discussion about work requirements; but, ironically, the bill that we're going to deal with tomorrow cuts this program called the SNAP Employment and Training Funding. This is a program that helps low-income individuals get training for proper employment, training for jobs that could help those individuals lift themselves out of poverty and off public assistance.

It is my understanding that my friends are going to bring a bill that guts that particular program. I find that puzzling because the whole point of that program is to give people the training they need so they are qualified for some of the jobs that are open out there, and yet we're going to eliminate that.

My friends have routinely gone after the SNAP, or food stamp program, again, helping low-income families get by during difficult times while they find employment. Sadly, there are a lot of people who are working who earn so little that they still qualify for SNAP. We ought to have a greater discussion on poverty and how to deal with some of these big issues like hunger and food

insecurity, and I hope at some point we can have that discussion.

But, today, what I wish we were doing, in addition to passing a non-controversial TANF bill, I wish we were on the floor debating an alternative to the sequester—750,000 jobs are about to be lost, 750,000 jobs. If we are truly interested in work, we ought to protect those jobs.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland had an alternative that four times he's brought to the Rules Committee. Four times the leadership here has said, no, you can't bring it to the floor, you can't debate it, you can't deliberate on it.

And my friends on the other side of the aisle in this Congress have offered zero. They're totally content to let the sequester go into play—750,000 jobs at stake.

I think that's what we should be doing here, Mr. Speaker.

As I yield back the balance of my time, I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to suspend politics for just a little while so we can get a few major things done. We can do the politics next year when it's campaign time, but now's the time to achieve results.

We can come together on a lot of these issues. I hope that that happens; but if this is any indication of how we're going to proceed, it makes me less hopeful.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to take a moment and respond to some of my friend's concerns and points. First, simply on sequester, with all due respect, I'm glad there's an interest now. There wasn't an interest last May when this House passed legislation. The Senate never picked it up; the President never offered a counter. There wasn't an interest last December. There seems to only be an interest here in the final, waning days.

Now, we actually think we're proceeding in the continuing resolution, perhaps in the upcoming budget debates, and perhaps later on in ways where we can come back and work in a bipartisan fashion. But our efforts to do that were twice rebuffed, and now we're beaten up for not doing it a third time. I think two chances is about as many as you get. And, again, we'll try to find another way to work with our friends on this thing.

As for the job loss, I couldn't agree more with my friend. This is a tremendously bad thing for the economy. This is not the right way to do things. We would have preferred to have done it differently.

Now, you can always arrive at some interesting figures on job loss. According to the CBO, the Affordable Care Act will cost 800,000 jobs. I doubt my friends would work with us to repeal that and save those 800,000 jobs. They've got other objectives there.

Our objective in the entire sequester effort is simply to begin to lower the

long-term debt for this country, a debt that is going to undermine the economy and destroy many, many, many tens of thousands of jobs in the coming years unless we deal with it. We're making that effort today in the Ryan budget, in the Budget Committee. That will be on the floor next week.

I know my friends will have an alternative for that. I welcome that. I'm glad they're doing that. They did not do that when they were in the majority.

The Senate finally, for the first time in 4 years, looks like it's going to put out a budget. It's not a budget that I would like, but they're going to put one out; and I think that's a very good thing.

So, again, I see some little gleams and glistenings of progress around here. And I do want to thank my friend because we have worked together in the last 70 or 80 days on some significant things. I worked with my friend on the fiscal cliff. I worked with my friend on Hurricane Sandy relief, worked with my friend on violence against women; and I very much appreciate his kind words about that.

So I actually see opportunities in front of us, as well as obvious differences and debates that we're surely going to have.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I believe that the underlying bill provides additional certainty for those currently on the TANF program and ensures that their benefits will not lapse at the end of the month, something I know that my friends are concerned about, just as we are, and want to ensure that that doesn't happen.

In addition, it maintains the bipartisan work requirements that this administration professes to support, but has clearly created some doubt about. So let's give them the opportunity, through this legislation, just to make sure that there's no misunderstanding, that both parties and the administration want to maintain the work requirements.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1455

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on H. Res. 107; adopting H. Res. 107, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 890, PRESERVING THE WELFARE WORK REQUIREMENT AND TANF EXTENSION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 107) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 890) to prohibit waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 195, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—233

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Billirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon

Burgess  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham

Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant

Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney

Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NAYS—195

Andrews  
Barrow (GA)  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro

DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur

Keating  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz

Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)

Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—3

Costa  
Lynch  
Sherman

□ 1527

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 64 I was at a meeting with the Vice President and others at the White House and was caught in traffic on the way back to the Capitol. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 194, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

## AYES—233

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bilirakis  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter

Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Eilmlers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming

Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler

Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan

Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Radel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Runyan

Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NOES—194

Andrews  
Barrow (GA)  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Courtney  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Dingell  
Dingeld  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Lewis

Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis

Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Loftgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel

Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David

Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speler  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas

## NOT VOTING—4

Bishop (UT)  
Costa

Graves (MO)  
Lynch

□ 1535

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 295, nays 120, answered “present” 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

## YEAS—295

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Bustos  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Capito  
Capps  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cartwright  
Cassidy  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chu  
Cicilline

Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Deuth  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Eilmlers  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)

Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Grayson  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Horsford  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston

Kline	Nadler	Sensenbrenner
Kuster	Napolitano	Sessions
Labrador	Neugebauer	Sewell (AL)
LaMalfa	Noem	Shea-Porter
Lamborn	Nunes	Sherman
Lankford	Nunnelee	Shimkus
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Shuster
Latta	Olson	Simpson
Levin	Palazzo	Sinema
Lipinski	Pascarella	Smith (NE)
Loeb sack	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lofgren	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Long	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Southerland
Lowey	Perry	Speier
Lucas	Peters (CA)	Stewart
Luetkemeyer	Petri	Stockman
Lujan Grisham	Pingree (ME)	Stutzman
(NM)	Pitts	Swalwell (CA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pocan	Takano
(NM)	Polis	Thompson (PA)
Maffei	Pompeo	Thornberry
Maloney,	Posey	Tiberi
Carolyn	Price (NC)	Tierney
Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Titus
Marino	Reichert	Tonko
Massie	Rice (SC)	Tsongas
Matsui	Richmond	Upton
McCarthy (CA)	Roby	Van Hollen
McCarthy (NY)	Roe (TN)	Vargas
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
McCollum	Rogers (MI)	Walden
McHenry	Rokita	Walorski
McIntyre	Ros-Lehtinen	Walz
McKeon	Roskam	Wasserman
McKinley	Ross	Schultz
McMorris	Rothfus	Waters
Rodgers	Roybal-Allard	Watt
McNerney	Ruiz	Waxman
Meadows	Runyan	Weber (TX)
Meehan	Ruppersberger	Webster (FL)
Meeks	Ryan (WI)	Welch
Meng	Salmon	Wenstrup
Messer	Scalise	Westmoreland
Mica	Schiff	Whitfield
Michaud	Schneider	Williams
Miller (FL)	Schock	Wilson (FL)
Miller (MI)	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
Miller, Gary	Schwartz	Wolf
Moran	Schweikert	Womack
Mullin	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Mulvaney	Scott, Austin	Yoho
Murphy (PA)	Scott, David	Young (IN)

## NAYS—120

Amash	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Andrews	Green, Al	Pallone
Bass	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Benishek	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Bentivolio	Griffith (VA)	Peters (MI)
Bera (CA)	Grijalva	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Hanna	Pittenger
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Radel
Butterfield	Holding	Rahall
Capuano	Honda	Reed
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Renacci
Chaffetz	Hudson	Ribble
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Rigell
Coble	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Conaway	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Joyce	Sánchez, Linda
Cotton	Kilmer	T.
Courtney	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Crowley	Kinzinger (IL)	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cummings	Lance	Slaughter
Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Stivers
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Thompson (CA)
Denham	Latham	Thompson (MS)
Dent	Lee (CA)	Lewis
Duffy	Lewis	LoBiondo
Fattah	LoBiondo	Lummis
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Marchant
Flores	Marchant	Matheson
Fox	Matheson	McDermott
Fudge	McDermott	McGovern
Garcia	McGovern	Miller, George
Gardner	Miller, George	Moore
Gerlach	Moore	Neal
Gibson	Neal	Negrete McLeod
Gingrey (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Nolan
Graves (GA)	Nolan	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

## NOT VOTING—15

Cantor	Hunter	Royce
Costa	Lynch	Serrano
Gohmert	Markey	Sires
Granger	Murphy (FL)	Terry
Huelskamp	Rangel	Young (FL)

□ 1542

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

# PRESERVING THE WELFARE WORK REQUIREMENT AND TANF EX- TENSION ACT OF 2013

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 107, I call up the bill (H.R. 890) to prohibit waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 107, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-3 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

## H.R. 890

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Preserving the Welfare Work Requirement and TANF Extension Act of 2013".*

## SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON TANF WAIVERS RELATING TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE TANF WORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may not do the following:

(1) *Finalize, implement, enforce, or otherwise take any action to give effect to the Information Memorandum dated July 12, 2012 (Transmittal No. TANF-ACF-IM-2012-03), or to any administrative action relating to the same subject matter set forth in the Information Memorandum or that reflects the same or similar policies as those set forth in the Information Memorandum.*

(2) *Authorize, approve, renew, modify, or extend any experimental, pilot, or demonstration project under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315) that waives compliance with a requirement of section 407 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 607) through a waiver of section 402 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602) or that provides authority for an expenditure which would not otherwise be an allowable use of funds under a State program funded under part A of title IV of such Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) with respect to compliance with the work requirements in section 407 of such Act to be regarded as an allowable use of funds under that program for any period.*

(b) *RESCISSION OF WAIVERS.*—Any waiver relating to the subject matter set forth in the Information Memorandum or described in subsection (a)(2) that is granted before the date of the enactment of this Act is hereby rescinded and shall be null and void.

## SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2013.

*Activities authorized by part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (other*

*than under section 403(b) of such Act) shall continue through December 31, 2013, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2012, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority on a quarterly basis through the first quarter of fiscal year 2014 at the level provided for such activities for the corresponding quarter of fiscal year 2012.*

## SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

*The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 890.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 890, Preserving the Welfare Work Requirement and TANF Extension Act of 2013.

In July of last year, the Obama administration's Department of Health and Human Services issued an information memorandum saying they would accept and approve applications from States seeking to waive the requirement that 50 percent of their welfare caseload be engaged in or preparing for work.

This work requirement was a critical part of the 1996 welfare reforms that created the current Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, cash welfare program. Those reforms also led to more work, more earnings, less welfare dependence, and less poverty among families headed by low-income single mothers.

Yet, without any thought of consulting Congress, as is required by law, the administration saw fit to unilaterally waive the work requirements and risk the progress that has been made in the last 16 years. And that's why we are considering this legislation here on the floor today.

Simply put, this bill would block waivers, so HHS can't allow States to bypass the work requirements and financial penalties Congress put in place in 1996 for failing to engage welfare recipients in work.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will argue that Republicans are making a big deal out of nothing and that we're responding to a problem

that doesn't exist since no States have applied for waivers—yet. But the American people have made their views clear. A survey last year revealed 83 percent support a work requirement as a condition for receiving welfare.

Clearly, the best way out of poverty is a job, and it's critical that our laws both foster job creation as well as ensure welfare is always a pathway to work. That's what this legislation is about: ensuring that work and other productive activities remain a central part of the TANF cash welfare program, as the 1996 reforms intended.

Setting aside the success of the work requirement in moving low-income individuals from welfare to work and the overwhelming support the policy enjoys among the American people, current law prohibits the administration from waiving the welfare work requirement. Waivers of certain State report requirements are permitted under the TANF program, but the work requirement may not be waived.

A summary of the 1996 reforms prepared by Ways and Means Committee staff immediately following the law's enactment could not be clearer on this point. It plainly states:

Waivers granted after the date of enactment may not override provisions of the TANF law that concern mandatory work requirements.

As a Member of Congress who helped write the welfare reform law and served as a conferee on the bill, the statement in this report actually captures the correct intent of Congress.

Historical precedent is not on the Obama administration's side, either. No prior administration, Republican or Democrat, has ever attempted to waive the work requirements in the 16 years between the law's enactment and the July 2012 information memorandum.

Following the July 2012 action, the Government Accountability Office looked into this and "did not find any evidence that HHS stated it has authority to issue waivers related to TANF work requirements." In short, no administration attempted to waive the work requirements because they knew it was illegal to do so.

Finally, if we need more evidence that, despite their promises to the contrary, the administration's policy would weaken the work requirement, we need look no further than the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office. This legislation saves \$61 million over 10 years because CBO recognizes the administration's waivers will allow some States that may otherwise pay penalties for failing to meet the work requirement to avoid such penalties through a waiver.

In addition to preventing the administration from waiving the work requirement, the legislation before us extends the TANF program's authorization at current funding levels through the remainder of this calendar year.

The TANF program provides helpful assistance to individuals most in need of a safety net as they look and prepare

for work. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION  
AND THE WORKFORCE,  
Washington, DC, March 8, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of H.R. 890, the Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 890 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 890, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration on this bill. However, I do so with the understanding that this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice the committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, DC, March 12, 2013.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 890, the "Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013," which is expected to be considered on the floor this week.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 890. I agree that your decision should not prejudice the Committee on Education and the Workforce with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 890 on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,  
Chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

Bringing up this bill today is doubly unfortunate. Number one, this is a time when we should be coming together—or at least trying to. This is a time when we should not try some partisan efforts. Unfortunately, that's what this is all about. This bill is essentially a pure fabrication of what is true.

□ 1550

Last summer the administration came forth with a proposal: states would be allowed to apply for waivers and have some flexibility in terms of the application of the work require-

ments—not the end of them or changing them, but the implementation of them—provided any project would be required to increase employment by at least 20 percent. So this claim that what is being done here is an effort to put at risk the work requirements is fallacious.

What happened? After HHS spoke, the Romney campaign decided they might have a campaign issue. So they essentially put together a campaign ad with the fallacious claim that what the Obama administration was trying to do was to weaken welfare reform. The instantaneous reaction of fact checkers was four Pinocchios, pants on fire, complete untruth.

And this is what Ron Haskins had to say, the Republican person on the staff most involved with the chairman and myself:

The idea that the administration is going to try to overturn welfare reform is ridiculous. States have to apply individually for waivers, and they have to explain in detail why the approach would lead to either more employment or better jobs for people who are trying to stay off welfare.

Indeed, earlier in 2005, 29 Republican Governors wrote asking if they could obtain a waiver in terms of the implementation of the work requirements, and on three occasions the Republicans brought legislation to the floor which would have brought about this kind of a waiver.

Here's what was said by President Clinton, who worked on welfare reform and signed it in 1996:

When some Republican Governors asked if they could have waivers to try new ways to put people on welfare back to work, the Obama administration listened.

And I insert at this point that there was a request from the Republican Governor of Utah.

I continue with the quote:

Because we all know it is hard for even people with good work histories to get jobs today. So moving folks from welfare to work is a real challenge, and the administration agreed to give waivers to those Governors and others only if they had a credible plan to increase employment by 20 percent, and they could keep the waivers only if they did increase employment. Now, did I make myself clear? The requirement was for more work, not less.

So this was tried last year. There was an effort by the Republicans. They came forth with a bill. The campaign was full blast. And what they wanted to do was to reaffirm or to support a political ad by their candidate for President. That's what that was all about.

We had a vote along partisan lines. And as we said, it went nowhere in the Senate. By the way, I don't think it helped their Presidential candidate as it was so blatantly false, so patently political.

The election is over. The people have spoken. The President has been re-elected. Why bring up this political horse? It's worse than lame; it's mistaken.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. CAMP. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, for 5 seconds that in the Statement of Administration Policy we got yesterday, they say that no States formally applied for State waivers.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today because Congress must ensure that work continues to be the centerpiece of the TANF welfare program, and I regret that we are here today debating the Obama administration's efforts to undermine work requirements.

I think that my Democrat colleagues would agree that our time would be better spent discussing bipartisan improvements to TANF and other programs designed to help low-income parents find and go to work. I look forward to having those discussions and conversations as the chairman of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, bipartisan discussions were actually happening before the Obama administration announced they would waive work requirements for welfare recipients last summer. That announcement completely undermined bipartisan negotiations in our committee about ways to strengthen this program. Incredibly, administration officials knew about those negotiations and even had a draft of bipartisan legislation in hand before they announced their misguided waiver policy.

Usually, if an administration wants to change the law, they must submit a legislative proposal for Congress to consider, but that's not what the Obama administration did with its proposal to waive the TANF work requirements.

Even though the administration had said repeatedly in their annual budget they would work with Congress to reform welfare, they didn't propose any changes to the program. Instead, they simply claimed they could waive the current work requirements at the heart of welfare reform without even notifying Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that the administration would proceed with its waiver policy, especially knowing that real bipartisan progress was being made.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the President's waiver policy increases spending by \$61 million, according to CBO. There are currently 240 combinations of work, education, and training requirements falling under the 12 definitions included in this law. The administration does not have the authority to waive work requirements; that authority is not granted under the law. Therefore—this is very important—the misuse of authority is subject to congressional review and disapproval. That's why we are here today. This is

Congress' responsibility, and we were working together with the White House, which is also our responsibility.

Today I'm standing here asking my colleagues across the aisle and on my side of the aisle to support this bill and reject the administration's waiver proposal. That way we can get back to working together to close loopholes, strengthen work requirements and ensure that more welfare recipients go back to work and move up the economic ladder.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another gentleman who has worked on welfare reform over the years, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LEVIN.

Well, we're at it again. There is no greater misuse of time than re-fighting the last election. The last election is just that: the last election. It's over.

Governor Romney's pollster said at the time, "We're not going to let our campaign be dictated by fact checkers," after it was pointed out that there were so many mistakes and miscalculations in their proposal.

They might not have cared about the facts, but today I do. I chaired the Democratic position with Lynn Woolsey and Vic Fazio at the behest of Dick Gephardt at the time. One of the goals of welfare reform was to move unemployed Americans from welfare to work, and it did work. The legislation has been very successful in meeting that goal.

□ 1600

Welfare reform put people back on the work rolls. Welfare rolls have dropped by half, and poverty amongst children has dropped as well. The administration's TANF waiver initiative continues on this success of promoting welfare to work. It is ludicrous for our Republican friends to try to get in the way of people working by their stopping this waiver initiative—an initiative, by the way, that the Republican Governors asked for. Bill Weld was a very successful Governor of Massachusetts on the issue of welfare reform. He wanted the waiver. He asked for the waiver, as did George Pataki of New York. They asked for the waivers, Republican Governors.

The President is not dropping welfare's work requirements. He is allowing the States to experiment. You would think our Republican friends would be entirely in favor of letting Governors experiment on getting people back to work fairly quickly. Secretary Sebelius has stated that the Department's goal is to accelerate job placement, requiring States to commit to a plan that will move at least 20 percent more people from welfare to work compared to the last marker of the State's performance. Let me repeat: a 20 percent increase in getting people on welfare to work from the last marker.

I must be missing something here. I sat through months and months and

months of deliberation. We reached a compromise. Some of us were disappointed in parts of it, but the Clinton administration signed on. It worked. Those are the facts, not opinions.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 890, to prevent the administration from gutting critical TANF work requirements which have been central to TANF's success over the past two decades.

President Clinton shared the belief that welfare reform should be about moving people from welfare to work, and the 1996 bipartisan welfare reform law he signed promoted work as central to these reforms. The TANF program's statutory work requirements have reduced poverty and welfare dependence for the program's recipients. Since the enactment of the 1996 welfare reform law with its work requirements, the number of individuals receiving welfare has dropped by 57 percent, and employment and earnings among single mothers has increased significantly.

In my home State of Arkansas, TANF success stories are based on the core work requirements. We've got the story of Suzette. When she started participating in Arkansas' Work Pays program, she was a single parent without child care or transportation. With TANF assistance and support from her caseworker, within 6 months, she was promoted to shift manager at McDonald's and then on to a career at Tyson Foods. Now Suzette is providing child care and transportation herself, and her self-sufficiency was made possible through this program's key work requirements. This success story is exactly why Arkansas has not requested a waiver from the work requirements. In fact, no State has requested a waiver.

The administration's unprecedented action of pushing the waiver idea is a fundamental unwinding of years of progress made toward work as the cornerstone of moving people from poverty to self-sufficiency. We must uphold TANF's statutory work requirements and protect Congress' constitutional authority to legislate. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 890.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Human Resources with jurisdiction over TANF.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the value of work. That's one of the reasons that I voted for the 1996 welfare reform law, because I wanted to see more people move from welfare to work. Our laws need to encourage job opportunities, but in the effort that we have before us

today, it seems to me that this legislation as proposed is less malevolent and more irrelevant to those poor people.

Because of the way the TANF program is currently structured, only about 1 percent of working-aged adults across America who are poor are participating in TANF work activities at any particular time. So, this afternoon, for 99 percent of the poor Americans who are not participating in TANF work activities, this bill is not all that significant. These are people who are struggling to get up the economic ladder at about the first rung. What happens and whether there are waivers or there are not waivers, I think they basically just feel that we've waved goodbye to their plight and are not responding to it in a constructive way.

It also is important to remember that we have a higher proportion of our population living near the bottom of the economic ladder today than when welfare reform was first enacted. In 2011, about 46 million American neighbors lived in poverty. About 350,000 of those lived in the San Antonio area. Amidst this poverty, amidst this growing inequality in resources in our country, we have the lowest level of poor children receiving direct cash assistance from TANF in almost 50 years. In my home State of Texas, one in every 20 poor children receives TANF assistance directly, and when children get assistance, they don't get very much.

As we look at the whole question of extending the TANF law, what we've had are only short-term extensions, not long-term reform. And each of these has provided some convenient political opportunities to reenforce the old welfare Cadillac stereotypes that just blame the poor for being poor. A previous extension we had out here focused on whether we would prohibit poor people from withdrawing any of their TANF benefits at a strip club or at a casino. It's not an unreasonable restriction, but it's hardly going to the core issue of how to get more Americans out of poverty and into the workplace, and I don't think today's bill helps in that regard either.

I believe that poverty should be viewed as a major national problem that needs a resolution by our working together and not viewed as a weapon to just score political points out of the last Presidential campaign.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. I think the real poverty at stake today is the poverty of cooperation, that of seeking a bipartisan response to poverty, a poverty of balance that contributes to the many children and their parents who are out there and who are seeing so little progress.

If you evaluate the TANF program and how it has operated over the last decade and a half, based upon the number of poor people who have been denied assistance, it has been a tremen-

dous success; but if you evaluate it based on how many poor people have moved out of welfare and into the workforce—into a job with a living wage that they're still in—I think the progress has been very spotty, at best.

The responsibility for those failures is shared broadly here in Washington and in the States, many of which just used the TANF resources to replace other things they were doing in the social service area. I believe that today's attempt to restrict State authority to strengthen welfare to work initiatives is totally contradictory with what's going on right now in the Budget Committee on block granting health assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. So, Mr. Speaker, rather than arguing over whether the States have all the flexibility they need, our goal ought to be: For the taxpayer and for poor Americans, how can we get more people into the workforce? And today's bill contributes little to that process.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that waiving the work requirement isn't going to get more people into work.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to rise in support of this proposed legislation before us today.

I have been sitting here, listening to the arguments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I've heard conflicting messages. I've heard that this is an irrelevant piece of legislation, that it's not necessary because no one is requesting a waiver, that HHS and the administration have not engaged in a policy that allows waivers to occur; yet in the same breath, in the same argument, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, But many Republican Governors are asking for waivers from States in going forward.

The point is: this needs to be clarified. This needs to be firmly stated in our record and in the laws of the land that TANF requires a work requirement for our welfare program.

I am a firm believer in the work requirements as they empower our unemployed, our underemployed—the folks who need it the most—to have the skill sets and the resources to put them back to work for generations to come so as to take care of their children and the people who are below them in regards to their needs.

□ 1610

What I would say is any effort to send a conflicting message that somehow waivers are an acceptable policy should be fought on both sides of the aisle and rejected. That's why this leg-

islation is necessary, and it is also necessary to get the reauthorization in place so that we can set the stage for a comprehensive, vigorous debate on welfare reform at the end of this 9-month reauthorization that this legislation does.

So I encourage my colleagues, this is not about a Presidential election; this is about firm, solid policy when it comes to our welfare rolls in America. This is about giving people the tools to get back to work, and that work under the welfare program makes sense and is good, sound policy. I urge my colleagues to join with us and support this reauthorization.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), another member of our committee, and a most active one.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LEVIN. I rise in opposition to this bill today.

The underlying premise of this bill has been roundly and routinely denounced by fact checkers. This bill is at best a solution looking for a problem. In 1997, I carried legislation in California to implement the Federal Government's welfare reform. It was the California welfare reform measure. We took our work seriously, and we took the work requirements in the Federal legislation seriously in California, and we worked across the aisle to adopt practical welfare reform. My bill was signed by the Republican Governor at the time, Governor Pete Wilson, and it's still being followed by the Democratic Governor of California today, Governor Jerry Brown.

Welfare reform in California has contributed to substantial increases in the employment of very low-income earners and markedly helped families in California move from welfare to work. Fifteen years later, the program caseload in California is roughly 60 percent of what it was in 1998, even in the face of this Great Recession that we're coming through.

Waivers can be an important tool to allow States the flexibility to run Federal programs in the most efficient and effective way, a tool used to move people from welfare to work, and it shouldn't fall the victim of politics. Every State is different—we hear that on this floor all the time. States should have the flexibility to do what they need to do in order to effectively and efficiently move people from welfare to work, and that's what this provision does.

And the idea that we're standing here today debating this, whether or not it should be expunged from the Federal tool chest, is purely politics, and it should not happen. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we spend a lot of time in this body talking about the need to be bipartisan. People rightly feel, I think, that

things get too polarized around here. I think back to the mid-nineties when Republicans controlled the House. We had a Democrat President, and people back then thought things were a bit too polarized as well. Yet in the midst of that atmosphere, Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich came up with landmark legislation to reform our welfare programs, and they did so in a bipartisan fashion.

One of the keys to the success of those reforms were the work requirement provisions that led to more jobs, bigger paychecks, and fewer people in poverty, children in particular. As President Clinton said at the time:

First and foremost, welfare reform should be about moving people from welfare to work.

As further proof that this is not a partisan issue, Republican or Democrat, I look to my own State of Indiana. Before the 1996 welfare reform law was passed, then-Governor Bayh, a Democrat, created similar work requirements for Hoosiers who received certain government benefits. Not only did Indiana's reforms ensure that those who needed assistance were able to receive it, but it also helped ensure that they were quickly back to taking care of themselves.

As Mr. Bayh later said:

The bottom line was trying to make someone self-sufficient. We were trying to achieve two values—one was the notion of community, and also responsibility.

Indiana's welfare-to-work initiative was a very successful program that remains a hallmark of his governorship.

With bipartisan consensus on this issue, and for all the talk in Washington about the need to be bipartisan, work across the aisle, it amazes me that HHS would unilaterally try and waive these work provisions. The welfare reform of the 1990s lifted millions out of poverty and put them on a path to self-sufficiency. It was a signature bill for bipartisanship in this town. Let's not undue these positive results by allowing HHS to gut key provisions of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, rarely have I been a fan of the concept that one size fits all. Therefore, I find it necessary to not be in favor of this legislation. However, I am strongly in favor of TANF. TANF is a greatly needed program. It provides temporary assistance to needy families, and we need to try to make those programs as effective as we possibly can. TANF is designed to help people who may have become parents too soon. Their jobs may have gone out of

business. They may have dropped out of school, don't have much in the way of formal education and training, and may even have a prison record.

In order to provide the most effective help, their State may need the flexibility to design and implement the best program they possibly can. They may even have clients who have three or four children and no husband or no wife. They may need babysitting help and cannot find it. They may need a waiver. I agree with the administration's position; and if a State determines that they can do a better job with the waiver, and Health and Human Services agrees, then they ought to be able to get one.

I've been told, and I believe, that if you give a man or woman a fish, they can eat for a day; but you teach them how to fish effectively, and they can eat for a lifetime. I disapprove of this restriction on this bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND), a cosponsor of the underlying bill.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Chairman for yielding me time this afternoon.

I am proudly standing here as an original cosponsor of this bill, H.R. 890. I think today gives us an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak with clarity and say once and for all, regardless of the interpretations and regardless of the arguments on this floor, that we require an individual, before they benefit and they take, that they must work. I think it is a very safe thing for us to do. It mirrors the culture of this country down through the years.

You know, I support these requirements because working is the best way to lift people out of poverty and give them the opportunity for earned success. I remember in my youth, my father, he clearly made us work. He made us understand the value of hard work. It wasn't a punishment; it wasn't cruel. He knew that through hard work that our character would be molded, and we would understand that through work and through the sweat of our brow that we would find the destiny for our own lives.

I think today what this body should do, and will do, is clarify that the work requirements of TANF is a good thing. These work requirements are bipartisan. We've all heard on the floor today the bipartisan effort between Republicans and Democrats alike during 1996. What we're saying is they were good then, and they are good today. Most importantly, I am pleased with what occurred back in the mid-nineties. When you're talking about almost 73 percent of those who were on welfare moved to work, that's a positive thing for the lives of the American people.

□ 1620

The administration's unprecedented actions are clearly circumventing this law and the will of the people, with

over 83 percent of Americans today believing that these work requirements are a positive thing.

It's common sense, it's a self-evident truth: if you want a positive future, you must help create that, and part of that requirement is that you must work.

I urge my colleagues today to join me in supporting H.R. 890 because it returns us to the real work of helping people who need it most.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I now with great pleasure yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership.

I rise in opposition to this TANF reauthorization bill that would deny States the opportunity to help put more unemployed people to work.

With 26 million working-age adults in America living below the poverty line, and millions struggling to stay afloat, I'm appalled that the House Republican priority is to bring to the floor a bill that further restricts the TANF program's ability to improve job outcomes and get people to work.

Funding for the TANF program has not kept pace with need. As a result, four out of five children living in poverty today are not being reached. Instead of targeting the President's reforms, which would actually increase flexibility for States, mind you, Congress should be focused on creating jobs and ladders of opportunity.

Now, I was on the conference committee that Congressman THOMPSON mentioned. I was in the California legislature, and I was on the conference committee that negotiated California's TANF program. And let me tell you, I voted against it. I voted against my own conference committee's report because, as a former welfare recipient myself, I didn't want to see more welfare recipients being penalized by a work requirement with no real effort and initiative and resources to help primarily women move from welfare to work.

This administration's reforms would correct for this, finally. It would create that flexibility that was needed then.

That's why yesterday myself, Congressmen RAÚL GRIJALVA, JUDY CHU, and EMANUEL CLEAVER, we submitted an amendment to restore the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund to further support our Nation's jobless workers and put people back to work.

It's not surprising that our amendment was ruled not in order by the Republican-controlled Rules Committee, but it does underscore the reality that Republicans are far more interested in scoring political points than they are in putting people back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. American families need a national strategy to end poverty, and this should be part of that. As chair of the Democratic whip's Task Force on Poverty and Opportunity, I'm working with all of our colleagues to advance that goal. Unfortunately, this reauthorization, though, takes us in the exact opposite direction.

We need to extend the TANF program, but this is not the way to do it. We need flexibility.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Preserving the Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013. This extension of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program not only provides families the resources they need to lift themselves out of poverty, but also maintains a valuable and bipartisan provision of the 1996 welfare reform law.

When first created, TANF was designated to get individuals back to work. Congress took further action in 2006 to strengthen work requirements after some States began counting activities like personal journaling, bed rest, and even weight loss as work activities.

Getting individuals back to work must remain TANF's purpose. However, HHS' unprecedented attempt to allow States to waive this work requirement has undermined this goal. These requirements were included in TANF for good reason.

If you're unemployed, maintaining your skill set is incredibly important to the company who wants to hire you. The longer you're out of work and the more your skills deteriorate, the less employable you are.

I can speak with some authority about this because I've owned and operated multiple businesses employing thousands of people. All things being equal, I would hire the individual who was most prepared to step into the position immediately.

So this is not about punishing those who are out of work. This is about giving those who are down on their luck the best chance to get back on their feet and start providing for their families again. If you speak to those that are out of work, that is what most will tell you they want: a chance to earn more money, help their family, and improve their situation in life.

I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle generally want to help those who are out of work. Instead of heated rhetoric, we should be focused on our common goal: providing much-needed assistance for the unemployed, while also helping them find the work they so desperately desire.

I ask my colleagues to come together and extend this important safety net, along with simple reforms that will ensure the program's effectiveness.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

I want to associate myself with all of the members from the distinguished Ways and Means Committee who have tried to explain to the majority authors of this bill that the waivers are narrowly offered and do not allow States to alter their work requirements.

These waivers would only be granted to those States who prove that they can quantitatively increase the number of their welfare beneficiaries who find and keep jobs. This waiver is in keeping with the Republican mantra of States' rights and allowing them to be flexible.

So we have heard a lot of hyperbole and exaggeration about what this does. And I think that really is in keeping with what we have heard about welfare reform since 1976, when Ronald Reagan trotted out the Welfare Queen, the woman who had 80 names, 30 addresses, and an annual income of \$150,000 when you count Medicaid and food stamps, and who drove around in a Cadillac.

So it's difficult to get people to listen when, as social and political scientists have said, these stereotypes have been driven for decades by gender and racial stereotypes. And I think that's what we're dealing with here today, Mr. LEVIN.

We are not going to hear the level of levity that we need because I think that the low-wage workforce benefits tremendously by women, and particularly women of color, working for nothing. So the prospect of them getting customized labor training, in lieu of wiping down a table in a diner, is a little bit more than they can stand.

You know, if, in fact, we're going to have true welfare reform where we're going to lift people out of poverty, then this bill is not the direction we should be taking.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 890 and preserving one of the most significant and successful Federal reform initiatives in the last 20 years.

Seventeen years ago, a Republican-led Congress worked with President Clinton to fix a broken welfare system. The bipartisan law that resulted established the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program. This law also required individuals to work, prepare for work, or look for work as a condition of receiving public assistance.

In the years following passage, the number of individuals receiving welfare

dropped by a whopping 57 percent. The poverty level among single mothers fell by 30 percent, and I saw this in my practice as an OB-GYN physician. No question that it worked.

□ 1630

And this is while their income and earnings increased significantly. Poverty levels among young African Americans dropped to its lowest level in 2001. Last July, the Department of Health and Human Services issued an unprecedented guidance indicating that it would allow States to waive welfare work requirements. The law and the historical record are clear: the administration does not have this power.

But if there's any confusion, H.R. 890 will dispel it. This commonsense bill would prohibit the Secretary of HHS from moving ahead with this illegal waiver plan. More than 80 percent of Americans support the work requirements included in welfare reform, and this legislation ensures the hard work of the 104th Congress and President Clinton isn't undone by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, we should celebrate work in this country. We should help those who are down on their luck find a job—something all the House will do later this week when it considers the SKILLS Act. And for those Americans who need help, we should offer it—but not as a permanent entitlement.

I commend Chairmen CAMP, KLINE, and SCALISE, along with Mr. SOUTHERLAND, for their leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

It is, and I think should be, the law in this country if you're able-bodied, you can't get welfare unless you work. That became the law in 1996.

Last year, two Republican Governors approached the administration and said, Before we send people to work full time, what we'd like to do is get them some training. So instead of simply getting a job, a person gets a career so they make some more money and don't wind up back on the welfare rolls because they're in a string of entry-level jobs. And the administration said to those two Republican Governors, Well, we'll let you do that, but only if you can prove that the result of this experiment will be more people are working, not fewer. The only way you can get this waiver is if you can prove that there will be more people moving from welfare to work than under the present system. This makes perfect sense to me.

It's said around here all the time that Washington should not dictate the rules, that one size does not fit all, and

that some of the best ideas come from our State capitals and local officials. If you believe those things, as I do, then you should vote against this bill. Because what this bill says is there will be no waivers, under any circumstances, for any Governor, whether it makes sense in their State or not. Keep this in mind.

Under the administration's policy, you can't get a waiver unless you can prove that more people move from welfare to work than under the present system. This is common sense. It's federalism. It lets the States do what they think is best under the right circumstances. And we should vote "no."

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, welfare work requirements have helped Michiganders and millions of Americans reduce their dependency on government assistance and get back on their feet again, and that's a good thing. And that, for many people, is the American Dream.

In the 1990s, while serving in the Michigan Legislature, I had the privilege of cosponsoring legislation that did this very thing in promoting workfare and edufare that ultimately became, arguably, the pattern for the 1996 Federal reform. It changed lives. We had welfare recipients who were completely reliant on government now given hope. I'll never forget the single-parent mother who was on welfare for most of her adult life and said in a public service announcement that she asked to be involved with, after going on edufare and then workfare, I was angry when I was first approached with this requirement. Now I can only say it changed my life. It not only changed my life in developing self-sufficiency, but it changed my family's life. They know that they can indeed make it on their own.

Those were illustrations that we experienced; and I saw how it worked in Michigan and then later in our country as a whole after the 1996 reforms. Unfortunately, last July, the Obama administration offered guidance that would undermine this requirement. Without consulting Congress, and despite bipartisan support for work requirements, the Department of Health and Human Services began moving forward this agenda. Congress should repeal the HHS's waiver plan and prevent the administration from waiving the work requirements. It's the right thing to do. It's time to move past this waiver debate so we can move forward with building a stronger, sounder TANF program that promotes self-sufficiency and positive action.

Please join me in supporting H.R. 890.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the floor leaders for their hard work, but I have another explanation for where we are today.

My colleague before me indicated that flexibility is important. It means that we, your Representatives, are listening to you. But I'm listening to more voices than just those who are here on this floor. I'm listening to the voices of those who want to get out of poverty, and I'm delighted to be part of a newly established caucus that focuses on eliminating poverty.

I was here for the first reform bill, and I do believe there's something important about work; but let us understand that when we talk about poverty, we're talking about children, we're talking about parents who are raising children and who may need to be home. We've always made the argument that mothers working at home is work.

I'm disappointed in this legislation primarily because it takes the flexibility away from Governors to determine how best to get people back to work. But why don't we bring a bill to the floor to raise the minimum wage from \$7 to \$9? Why do we not listen to people who say, I barely can make it, such as one of my constituents who said, Not only am I at minimum wage, but they require me to pay for my parking. Can I please get a lift?

Or maybe we're not aware of title 3 in the housing act that has people in public housing being able to work, which was an amendment that I offered to that particular title to allow those to work on projects that the housing authority has. My housing authority just told me that people are lining up to work. They have people working.

So this is not about making people work. It's about ignoring and picking on, again, President Obama's administration because they decide to listen to Republican and Democratic Governors to work on behalf of the American people. Let's get it right. Let's talk about getting people out of poverty. Let's raise the minimum wage. Let's talk about the flexibility so that people can work. Because they want to work. I haven't heard anybody that doesn't want to work. But realize if you are getting TANF, you're getting it because of your children, because of some situation that puts you in a place that you hope to get out of.

I don't think it is the right thing to do to strangle the hands of the administration doing what the American people would like them to do. Let's vote against this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to simply express my disappointment in H.R. 890, The Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013, which it actually does not do.

I had an amendment prepared which would simply make the effective date for this bill of December 2035. This is not a whimsical attempt to delay implementation; but merely an expression of my frustration that Members on the other side have come to disagree with policies which their Caucus, past and present, helped to create and foster.

In 2012, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that it would consider requests from the states to operate dem-

onstration projects within the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program to help recipients prepare for, find and maintain employment.

The effort was partially a response to requests from governors throughout the United States—including many Republican governors—asking for just such flexibility to operate TANF. The Secretary of HHS has stated that any governor wanting such a waiver must commit that their proposal will move at least 20 percent more people from welfare to work.

Rather than embrace the Administration's efforts to provide states flexibility, however, Republicans in Congress have waged a disingenuous campaign against the waiver proposal, drawing rebukes from fact-checkers.

On Feb. 28, House Republicans introduced H.R. 890 to prohibit the Administration from granting such flexibility to states. The bill was unanimously opposed by my Democratic colleagues during a Committee markup held on March 6, 2013.

This year's action comes after Republicans took nearly identical action last fall. After passing it out of the Ways and Means Committee against unanimous opposition from Committee Democrats, House Republicans passed a resolution disapproving of the Administration's flexibility plan on Sept. 20, 2012.

Let's look at some facts:

**Same Waiver Authority Used by President Clinton**—On July 12, 2012, HHS issued guidance that it was exercising the agency's authority under Section 1115 of the Social Security Act to entertain requests from States to conduct demonstration projects under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. A legal analysis from the Congressional Research Service (CRS) found that HHS' current waiver initiative is "consistent" with the prior practice under the Clinton Administration, which permitted dozens of welfare waivers prior to the enactment of the 1996 welfare law.

**Projects Must Focus on Increasing Work**—The HHS notice clearly and repeatedly states that all demonstration projects must be "focused on improving employment outcomes." Such outcomes must be demonstrated by a rigorous evaluation, and states must meet targets for accelerating job placements for welfare recipients.

**Cutting Red Tape and Increasing Performance**—Governor Herbert of Utah, a Republican, informed HHS that his state would like to be evaluated on the basis of the state's success in placing welfare recipients into employment, rather than on their participation in certain activities, and that this approach "would require some flexibility at the state level and the granting of a waiver."

**Providing States with Flexibility, While Holding them Accountable**—HHS Secretary Sebelius has stated, "the Department is providing a very limited waiver opportunity for states that develop a plan to measurably increase the number of beneficiaries who find and hold down a job."

Specifically, Governors must commit that their proposals will move at least 20 percent more people from welfare to work compared to the state's past performance."

**No Effect on Funding Levels or Time Limits**—Nothing in the waiver authority applies to the current five-year federal time limit on TANF assistance. Additionally, demonstration projects will in no way affect the fixed block

grant amounts now provided to states under the TANF program.

**Republicans Were For Welfare Waivers Before They Were Against Them**—In 2002, 2003, and 2005 Republicans passed legislation on the House floor that included a provision allowing the waiver of TANF work requirements. While these waiver proposals were broader and affected many more programs than the policy now proposed by HHS, the Congressional Research Service confirms that all of these bills “would have had the effect of allowing TANF work participation standards to be waived” Chairman CAMP, along with Speaker BOEHNER and Representative RYAN, voted for all three of these bills.

**Claims that Waivers Remove Work Requirements Are Clearly False**—President Clinton, who signed the 1996 welfare reform law, said “When some Republican governors asked if they could have waivers to try new ways to put people on welfare back to work, the Obama administration listened because we all know it’s hard for even people with good work histories to get jobs today. So moving folks from welfare to work is a real challenge. And the administration agreed to give waivers to those governors and others only if they had a credible plan to increase employment by 20 percent, and they could keep the waivers only if they did increase employment. Now, did I make myself clear? The requirement was for more work, not less.”

Ron Haskins, the lead Republican Congressional staffer in charge of drafting the 1996 welfare reform law, has said “there is merit to what the Administration is proposing,” and “I don’t see how you can get to the conclusion that the waiver provision undermines welfare reform.” Politifact declared that Governor Romney’s claim that the waiver proposal would eliminate work requirements for welfare recipients was “pants on fire” false. The fact checker said the contrary was true, stating: “by grating waivers to states, the Obama administration is seeking to make welfare-to-work efforts more successful, not end them.”

FactCheck.org says Romney’s claims on the issue “distorts the facts” and is “simply not true.” It reiterates that work requirements are not being dropped under the waiver proposal, and that “benefits still won’t be paid beyond an allotted time.”

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his hard work on this.

Mr. Speaker, Hoosiers understand that welfare checks are not a substitute for paychecks. Last year, President Obama’s administration really undermined commonsense and time-tested reforms by trying to weaken work requirements that were created in the 1996 bipartisan welfare reform law. These work requirements helped lift Americans out of poverty and into the workforce. In just 5 years, welfare dependency was nearly cut in half, more single mothers found jobs, and child poverty fell drastically. Unfortunately, President Obama’s decision to reverse course will drive up government spending without doing anything to lower unemployment.

Growing up on a farm in northern Indiana, I learned at a very young age

that a good neighbor is someone who will roll up their sleeves to help someone pick themselves back up, that neighbors look out for neighbors, friends look out for friends, and family looks out for family. And that’s exactly the commonsense approach that Chairman CAMP’s bill takes.

This legislation extends assistance to fight poverty by restoring the work requirements that made welfare reform a success in the 1990s. I appreciate and applaud Chairman CAMP for introducing this legislation to help American families without creating a permanent subsidy. Americans want to work, but we need to make sure that they have the skills and they’re capable and willing to perform the jobs that are provided to them in their communities.

□ 1640

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House will act to protect our Nation’s welfare-to-work programs, which have been enormously successful in moving millions of Americans out of poverty, off government dependency, and into jobs since 1996. Following the implementation of welfare-to-work requirements, the number of individuals receiving welfare dropped by 57 percent, poverty among single mothers fell by 30 percent, and child poverty decreased dramatically.

Welfare reform laws specifically forbid any administration from changing the work requirements without congressional approval. The current administration has ignored this and attempted to waive the work requirement, which would destroy critical aspects of welfare reform and years of progress.

With the passage of H.R. 890, the House will block the administration’s controversial waiver plan, and in the days ahead I hope the administration will work with Congress, instead of around it, to strengthen the TANF program and help low-income families achieve financial independence.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It’s so ironical it’s worse than that. The Republicans are in their budget saying, “let’s block grant Medicaid and all nutrition programs and send back those programs entirely to the States in the name of flexibility.” And now they come forth arguing that the proposal of this administration to provide

flexibility to the States, if requested, and if it increases work participation 20 percent, they throw up their hands and say, “no.” It’s worse than contradictory.

CRS has made clear the following:

The Secretary’s interpretation of her current authority under section 1115 with regard to waivable TANF provisions under section 402 appears consistent with the Secretary’s practice under the same provision as it existed under the AFDC program.

TANF is going to be extended. We don’t need to do it with this provision that harks back to the campaign. The 20 percent requirement, the Secretary made clear, it isn’t waiving the work requirement; it’s letting the States implement it. It was requested by the Governor of Utah, a Republican.

Bill Clinton has been mentioned so often. And I just urge everybody to listen to what he said. It strengthens the work requirements:

The requirement was for more work, not less.

So to come forth here and say that it weakens it is fallacious, to put it mildly.

Do you know what this is in a few words? This is an effort in 2013 to validate a fallacious political ad of the year 2012. And that’s worse than unhappy when this place is searching for some ability to work together.

The election is over. Let’s get on with the work ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say—as other speakers have mentioned—the 1996 welfare reform law has been tremendously successful. It has lowered welfare roles, it has lifted people out of poverty, it has reduced poverty for single mothers, and reduced poverty for children. And before that, before we had the 1996 welfare reform law, whether times were good or bad, welfare rolls only increased.

Clearly, the welfare reform law has been successful. Frankly, we need to protect the law from this administration, because what this administration wants to do is undermine the work requirement in welfare.

And what are we talking about here? The work requirement is really that only half of the welfare caseload has to be in work. That means for the other half, States have ultimate flexibility to determine how to move those people into job readiness and to work. For the half of the people that need to be in some form of work requirement there are 12 definitions of what is work in the law. Let me just list those off:

Subsidized private employment, subsidized government employment, job search, community service. You can be in community service and that qualifies for work.

Work experience, on-the-job training. If you’re getting training related to your job, that counts as work.

Vocational education. So you can be training in a vocational discipline and still have that qualify for work.



Caring for the child of a TANF recipient in community service. So you can care for somebody else's child and that counts as work. And we're only talking about half of the welfare caseload.

Job skills training, education related to employment, completion of secondary school. That all counts as work.

Let's look at the Statement of Administration Policy. They say that no States have formally applied for waivers. No States are asking for this because they already have tremendous flexibility.

But let me just say, if you're going to change the law—and what this administration is trying to do is change the law—you don't just send a letter, or what they're calling an information memorandum. What is that?

Frankly, when the Government Accountability Office looked at this, they said they can't do business this way. This is a rule. And to follow a rule they need to follow the Congressional Review Act, they need to follow the law. And the law says they need to notify Congress, which they did not do. This is something they did on their own.

So on many levels we need to turn this around. They've entered into a gray murky area that we really don't know what they're doing, whether it's legal or not, whether States will have authority to do this or not. Given that the law was explicit that there is no waiver of this work requirement, given that this work requirement was a condition for States getting a cash payment, a block sum amount in welfare, and given the flexibility that was written into the law, it's very important that we make this clear.

Frankly, I think my friends on the other side should be joining Republicans in protecting the constitutional authority of the Congress to make the laws, not the bureaucrats at the Department of Health and Human Services. So I would ask my friends, vote for this bill, support the work requirement, support the ability of the Congress to make the laws under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against H.R. 890 because it, just like nearly identical legislation brought before the Ways and Means Committee last year, is based on partisan charges that have been widely discredited by independent fact checker. It would also block new and innovative ways to move more people from welfare to work. At a time when Congress confronts so many pressing issues, not the least of which is preventing the misguided cuts in the sequester from hurting our economy, H.R. 890 is a step in the wrong direction.

H.R. 890 prevents the administration from pursuing flexible, innovative ways to return people to work. As Health and Human Services Secretary Sebelius informed our committee, "the Department is providing a very limited waiver opportunity for states that develop a plan to measurably increase the number of beneficiaries who find and hold down a job. Specifically, Governors must commit that

their proposals will move at least 20% more people from welfare to work compared to the state's past performance."

The Congressional Research Service (CRS), in reviewing the administration's authority to permit demonstration projects, found that the current waiver initiative is "consistent" with prior practice. The CRS review found that dozens of waivers for demonstration projects have been approved in the past when their subject matter has been referenced in Section 402 of the Social Security Act (just as the administration currently proposes). CRS also found nothing in the law bars Secretary Sebelius from providing waivers related to employment activities in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program.

H.R. 890 seems more focused on politics than on policy. On that basis, and because it would impede progress in helping more welfare recipients move into work, I oppose this legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 890—Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013.

This bill prohibits the Secretary of HHS from using longstanding authority to issue waivers that allow states to conduct demonstration projects under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. It also reauthorizes the TANF program through December 31, 2013.

In Texas over 68,000 families receive TANF benefits. TANF is a block grant program to help move recipients into work and turn welfare into a program of temporary assistance.

In order to receive the maximum TANF benefit, families must be in compliance with work requirements and no one may remain on TANF for more than 60 months. Federal TANF law requires states to penalize families that fail to meet these requirements.

In response to a request from a bipartisan group of governors for more flexibility, the Obama Administration said the federal government would consider waiving existing work participation requirements for states that were experimenting with "new, more effective ways" of helping welfare applicants find work, "particularly helping parents successfully prepare for, find, and retain employment."

The Administration hasn't gotten rid of the work requirement or laid out a new theory of what it ought to include. It has given states the ability to seek executive branch approval for new methods.

This legislation is not needed, for no state has requested a waiver. This is the second time this bill has been introduced, as a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

The House should focus on extending TANF benefits to needy families in the country.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 890. I urge members of both parties to oppose this legislation, which in only a few pages demonstrates all that is wrong with Washington—politicians putting partisan concerns ahead of constructive policy. Governors from several states have overcome partisan differences to support the waivers H.R. 890 wishes to eliminate. Let us follow their lead and defeat this legislation together.

H.R. 890 is a simplistic bill. It prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from giving effect to the July 2012 guidance that granted states waivers regarding the design of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families

(TANF) programs. It also prohibits further experimentation, banning pilot programs or demonstration programs that could potentially revolutionize TANF, making it more effective and less costly. Though these changes seem small, they can mean a world of difference for families in need of the training and educational opportunities that new approaches to TANF could provide.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is one of the most remarkable pieces of work that I have ever seen considered on this floor. Not because it is such a bad piece of policy. Not because of how abominably it misrepresents the current state of federal and state practices. Not even because we are still litigating a claim which was dreamed up by a failed presidential campaign last summer, and which was roundly rejected by the American people.

No, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is remarkable because my friends across the aisle are demanding that we wrest control from the states in favor of a more inflexible and inefficient approach. The claims of federalism invoked by my Republican colleagues in so many of legislative battles I have witnessed over the years are nowhere to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 890 is wrong—and it is wrong for all the wrong reasons.

Despite H.R. 890's claims, the waivers granted to TANF program operators in July 2012 do not weaken TANF's work requirements—they strengthen them. These waivers provide states with the opportunity to determine what works best for them. These waivers allow states to experiment with alternative employment and training programs that reflect the varied problems confronting TANF recipients who wish to join the work force. Successful programs can then be replicated in other states and limited resources can be stretched further to ensure more effort is expended finding jobs instead of complying with red tape.

Despite what H.R. 890 presumes, these waivers won't lead to TANF recipients laying on hammocks, but rather are the key to unlocking the potential of men and women who want their own piece of the American dream. The waivers will allow program officials to provide the training and education necessary for many beneficiaries to join the ever more competitive labor market. Further, they will allow states to tailor their programs to the specific demands of their local economies, and ensure that TANF continues to improve in its mission to see recipients become self-sufficient. This—Mr. Speaker—is what good government looks like. This—Mr. Speaker—is why Republican and Democratic governors across the nation support these waivers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my friends across the aisle to put aside partisan concerns for just this moment and vote their conscience on this matter. I want them to ask whether they can in good conscience continue to oppose these commonsense reforms simply because it plays well with the fringes of their party. I want them to consider what it will sound like next time I hear from them that the federal government is too large and should cede more authority to the states. I want them to consider what people will hear when they claim to favor state solutions to national problems. Quite simply I want them to consider their professed principles instead of partisan politics—for if they do, they cannot support H.R. 890.

I urge everyone, Democrat and Republican, to vote “no” on H.R. 890. We’ve litigated this long enough—lets finally put it to rest.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I must express my profound surprise by the Republican effort to undermine state flexibility to strengthen work outcomes for people who receive TANF. In contrast to prior Republican support for such TANF waivers, in contrast to longstanding Republican advocacy for greater state flexibility, and in contrast to the reality that the TANF waivers would actually accelerate job placements and dramatically improve work outcomes, the current Republican rhetoric jettisons past support for state flexibility to improve TANF outcomes and disingenuously charges the Administration with gutting welfare reform. It is in states’ best interests to improve the work outcomes of their citizens, which is why Republican and Democratic governors have asked for the type of flexibility provided by the Administration’s waiver.

Under current rules, a state can meet its work requirement even if no recipient finds a job. In contrast, approved demonstration waivers explicitly would focus on improving employment outcomes. Under current rules, states spend very little of their TANF funds on work activities and substantial resources monitoring participation in activities. In contrast, approved demonstration waivers would help states make more effective and efficient use of limited resources. Under current rules, people are discouraged from getting a high school diploma or GED, even though they’re more likely to find good jobs with such education. In contrast, approved demonstration waivers would allow states to focus on building a better skilled workforce.

Under current rules, people working in subsidized jobs don’t count toward the state’s work rate. In contrast, Illinois boasted one of the most successful subsidized employment programs in the nation while using TANF Emergency Funds. The program directly placed almost 30,000 unemployed and underemployed adults in jobs that paid approximately \$10 per hour, putting almost \$9 million dollars into the pockets of hard working Illinoisans and into the economy. Almost 5000 employers in Illinois benefited.

Why Republicans would oppose innovative programs to help the unemployed get solid jobs is simply puzzling. Rather than advancing political theatre, the Republicans should be working with Democrats to replace the across-the-board spending cuts, strengthen the middle class, create jobs, expand our economy, and responsibly bring down the deficit. It is these proactive steps at governing that my constituents seek.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 890, the Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Act of 2013. This legislation would overturn the Administration’s proposal to allow states greater flexibility to help more Americans move from welfare to good jobs. Several states have requested this flexibility, including some states with Republican governors and legislatures. This is a politically disingenuous bill which only prevents Congress from devoting our time to finding actual solutions to lowering our unemployment rate.

As a condition of receiving federal TANF funding, states are required to document the number of hours that welfare recipients spend

in paid jobs, voluntary work, or other activities directly related to finding employment. Many states have argued that the current law’s requirements are onerous and counterproductive to helping welfare recipients find work to lift their families out of poverty.

In response to state feedback, the Administration proposed a program to allow states to use alternate, outcome-based measures for job placement, rather than relying solely on numerical work participation standards. This waiver would give states the flexibility needed to improve the effectiveness of TANF programs by focusing on the outcomes that matter to our families. The Administration’s waiver program has strict requirements to hold states accountable for making measurable progress in job placement.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 890, which would hinder states’ autonomy and flexibility in finding solutions that work for their residents. Instead of wasting time on partisan proposals, we must work across the aisle to find real solutions for working families in my Dallas district and across the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 107, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1650

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ENYART. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Enyart moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 890, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PROTECTING UNEMPLOYED PARENTS, INCLUDING VETERANS, WOMEN, VICTIMS OF NATURAL DISASTERS, AND GRANDPARENTS WHO ARE RAISING THE CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

Nothing in this Act shall prohibit or limit a State which is receiving funds under section 403 (a)(1) of the Social Security Act from providing assistance, job opportunities, or educational training authorized in this Act, for—

- (1) unemployed parents, including veterans, women who are victims of domestic violence, and victims of natural disasters; or
- (2) grandparents caring for children who have a parent who is, or who had a parent who died while being, a member of the United States Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I haven’t been in Washington very long. Like so many in southern Illinois and across

our Nation, I answered the call to serve. I grew up in a household where I was taught the importance of fairness, duty, and honor. Whether it was walking the beans on my grandparents’ farm or working with my father on the line at Caterpillar, I understood the importance of hard work, fair pay, and taking responsibility for myself and our family.

When I was 19, I enlisted and arrived for duty at Scott Air Force Base, a vital component of our national security and major employer in the district I now represent. For 35 years, I served in the military. For the past 5 years, I served as the Adjutant General of the Illinois National Guard, where I led our response to natural disasters and oversaw the largest deployment of Guard troops since World War II. Serving alongside those 13,000 soldiers and airmen and hundreds of civilian employees proved to me that the resiliency of Illinoisans, whether recovering from floods, ice storms, or earthquakes, or coming together as a community to support our service men and women overseas, is unparalleled.

Today, I offer the final amendment to the bill. It will not delay nor kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

From my experience as an enlisted man to that of commander of the Illinois National Guard, I’m concerned about how this bill interferes with States’ rights and might unfairly affect unemployed veterans and their families, victims of domestic violence, and victims of natural disasters, as well as grandparents caring for children whose parents are deployed.

In January, families in Sparta, a town I represent in southern Illinois, had the joy and blessing to welcome home over 150 soldiers with the Guard’s 661st Engineer Company and 662nd Engineer Fire Fighting Detachment from Afghanistan. I was the commander who signed their deployment orders and sent them into harm’s way. I was honored to see their safe return. For many of these men and women, their return means making a young family whole again. They could not have borne their responsibilities in Afghanistan without support from grandparents, spouses, and a community like Sparta.

That’s why I’m so alarmed by this bill in its current form. Why would Congress seek to make it more difficult for a single parent or grandparent to care for children while their mother or father is deployed overseas? Is that the message we want to send our troops, that their service is a burden to those back home?

For our veterans in Sparta and across the Nation facing new, sometimes heartbreaking challenges in their transition to civilian life, know that the promises we made to them are on the line. For us in southern Illinois, I’ll be blunt. We need jobs.

Southern Illinois hasn’t seen an economic recovery yet. Out of 102 counties

in Illinois, six in my district in southern Illinois are among those struggling most, with more than 20 percent of families trying to make ends meet on incomes less than \$23,000 a year.

The fact is that our heroes, our veterans returning home, don't necessarily have jobs waiting for them. That's why this bill in its current form is so out of touch with the realities that our veterans face. Instead, Congress is telling our veterans and our military families: your service isn't good enough. You haven't done enough for our Nation. Once again, Congress has gotten it wrong.

Another example, in Illinois we don't qualify assistance for victims of domestic violence. That's why I have to ask, given the critical need for us to responsibly reduce the deficit and actually work on improving our economy, why would Congress focus on questioning the expertise and recommendations made by my State or any other?

Where I come from and where I'm proud to represent, we all share the southern Illinois values of hard work, integrity, and fairness. Veterans and military families, victims of domestic abuse, communities overcoming natural disaster, like Harrisburg, Illinois, these are the good people who shouldn't be pawns of politics in Congress, and we owe them the assurance that this bill will not reduce critical assistance.

I urge my colleagues to stand by our veterans and military families. I urge them to consider honoring our home State's authority. I ask they pass this commonsense amendment to invest in the resiliency of our communities.

I yield back the balance of my time

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most unnecessary and meaningless motions to recommit I've seen in my time in Congress. The definition of who's eligible for TANF is left to the States. So the idea that somehow this motion to recommit singles out unemployed parents, TANF applies to unemployed parents. TANF applies to people that are veterans. TANF applies to people who are grandparents. It's about getting the unemployed jobs.

So I have to say, I'm puzzled by this. It seems totally political and completely unnecessary. None of these groups mentioned in this motion to recommit are excluded from receiving TANF benefits.

What this is about is not weakening the work requirement. I understand why the administration may want to weaken the work requirement since their record on job creation is so atrocious. But the fact is that States have tremendous flexibility here. Half of the caseload doesn't have to meet the work requirement. They can be engaging in whatever activity or no activity the

State determines. The other half has 12 different categories, including vocational training and other job readiness activities, that will qualify as work.

This is a straight extension of current law. This is an extension of current law that has proven extremely successful. Let's not weaken the requirement. Let's extend the welfare program, the TANF program, at current levels, and let's get people back to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 230, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—199

Andrews	Enyart	Lujan Grisham
Barber	Eshoo	(NM)
Barrow (GA)	Esty	Luján, Ben Ray
Bass	Farr	(NM)
Beatty	Fattah	Maffei
Becerra	Foster	Maloney
Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (NY)	Gabbard	Markey
Blumenauer	Gallo	Matheson
Bonamici	Garamendi	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Garcia	McCarthy (NY)
Braley (IA)	Grayson	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	McDermott
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	McGovern
Bustos	Grijalva	McIntyre
Butterfield	Gutierrez	McNerney
Capps	Hahn	Meeks
Capuano	Hanabusa	Meng
Cárdenas	Hastings (FL)	Michaud
Carney	Heck (WA)	Miller, George
Carson (IN)	Higgins	Moore
Cartwright	Himes	Moran
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)
Castro (TX)	Holt	Nadler
Chu	Honda	Napolitano
Ciilline	Horsford	Neal
Clarke	Hoyer	Negrete McLeod
Clay	Huffman	Nolan
Cleaver	Israel	O'Rourke
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Owens
Cohen	Jeffries	Pallone
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Cooper	Jones	Payne
Courtney	Kaptur	Pelosi
Crowley	Keating	Perlmutter
Cuellar	Kennedy	Peters (CA)
Cummings	Kildee	Peters (MI)
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Petersen
Davis, Danny	Kind	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Pocan
DeGette	Kuster	Polis
Delaney	Langevin	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Rahall
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Dingell	Levin	Richmond
Doggett	Lewis	Roybal-Allard
Doyle	Lipinski	Ruiz
Duckworth	Loebbeck	Ruppersberger
Edwards	Lofgren	Rush
Ellison	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Lowey	

Sánchez, Linda	Sinema
T.	Sires
Sanchez, Loretta	Slaughter
Sarbanes	Smith (WA)
Schakowsky	Speier
Schiff	Swalwell (CA)
Schneider	Takano
Schrader	Thompson (CA)
Schwartz	Thompson (MS)
Scott (VA)	Tierney
Scott, David	Titus
Serrano	Tonko
Sewell (AL)	Tsongas
Shea-Porter	Van Hollen
Sherman	Vargas

NAYS—230

Aderholt	Gowdy	Pearce
Alexander	Granger	Perry
Amash	Graves (GA)	Petri
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Grimm	Pompeo
Barr	Guthrie	Posey
Barton	Hall	Price (GA)
Benishek	Hanna	Radel
Bentivolio	Harper	Reed
Bilirakis	Harris	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Renacci
Black	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Bonner	Hensarling	Rigell
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Brady (TX)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hunter	Rokita
Bucshon	Hurt	Rooney
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jenkins	Roskam
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cantor	Jordan	Royce
Capito	Joyce	Runyan
Carter	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	King (IA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (NY)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kingston	Schock
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kline	Scott, Austin
Cole	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Conaway	Lance	Shuster
Cook	Lankford	Simpson
Cotton	Latham	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Long	Southerland
Culberson	Lucas	Stewart
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stockman
Denham	Marchant	Stutzman
Dent	Marino	Terry
DeSantis	Massie	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Tiberi
Duffy	McClintock	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Upton
Ellmers	McKinley	Valadao
Farenthold	McMorris	Wagner
Fincher	Rodgers	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walden
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walorski
Fleming	Messer	Weber (TX)
Flores	Mica	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fox	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gerlach	Noem	Womack
Gibbs	Nugent	Woodall
Gibson	Nunes	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gohmert	Olson	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (FL)
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Costa

Lynch

□ 1735

Messrs. NUNES, JOYCE, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. CRENSHAW, CARTER, COTTON, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. SCALISE and BURGESS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. COOPER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 181, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—246

Aderholt	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Alexander	Farenthold	Kirkpatrick
Amodei	Fincher	Kline
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bachus	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Barber	Fleming	Lamborn
Barletta	Flores	Lance
Barr	Forbes	Lankford
Barrow (GA)	Fortenberry	Latham
Barton	Fox	Latta
Benishek	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski
Bentivolio	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Bera (CA)	Garcia	Long
Bilirakis	Gardner	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Black	Gerlach	Lummis
Blackburn	Gibbs	Maffei
Bonner	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Goodlatte	Matheson
Brooks (IN)	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McCaul
Buchanan	Granger	McClintock
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McIntyre
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Campbell	Grimm	McMorris
Cantor	Guthrie	Rodgers
Capito	Hall	McNerney
Carter	Hanna	Meadows
Cassidy	Harper	Meehan
Chabot	Harris	Messer
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Mica
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)
Cole	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary
Collins (NY)	Holding	Mullin
Conaway	Hudson	Mulvaney
Cook	Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Cramer	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Crawford	Hunter	Noem
Crenshaw	Hurt	Nugent
Culberson	Issa	Nunes
Daines	Jenkins	Nunnelee
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Olson
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Dent	Jones	Palazzo
DeSantis	Jordan	Paulsen
DesJarlais	Joyce	Pearce
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Perry
Duffy	King (IA)	Peters (CA)
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Peterson
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Petri

Pittenger	Runyan	Tipton
Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Poe (TX)	Salmon	Upton
Pompeo	Scalise	Valadao
Posey	Schock	Wagner
Price (GA)	Schrader	Walberg
Radel	Schweikert	Walden
Reed	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Renacci	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Ribble	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Westmoreland
Rigell	Simpson	Whitfield
Roby	Sinema	Williams
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Rogers (MI)	Southerland	Womack
Rohrabacher	Stewart	Woodall
Rokita	Stivers	Yoder
Rooney	Stockman	Yoho
Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman	Young (AK)
Roskam	Terry	Young (FL)
Ross	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Rothfus	Thornberry	
Royce	Tiberi	

## NOES—181

Amash	Garamendi	Pallone
Andrews	Grayson	Pascarell
Bass	Green, Al	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Green, Gene	Payne
Becerra	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Gutierrez	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Hahn	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Polis
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bridenstine	Himes	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Rahall
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Rangel
Bustos	Honda	Richmond
Butterfield	Horsford	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Hoyer	Ruiz
Capuano	Huffman	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Israel	Rush
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Chu	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Keating	Schiff
Clarke	Kennedy	Schneider
Clay	Kildee	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kind	Scott, David
Cohen	Kuster	Serrano
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Loebback	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Takano
DeFazio	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	(NM)	Tierney
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DeBene	(NM)	Tonko
Deutch	Markey	Tsongas
Dingell	Massie	Van Hollen
Doggett	Matsui	Vargas
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Veasey
Duckworth	McCollum	Vela
Edwards	McDermott	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	Meeks	Walz
Enyart	Meng	Wasserman
Eshoo	Miller, George	Schultz
Esty	Moore	Waters
Farr	Moran	Watt
Fattah	Nadler	Waxman
Foster	Napolitano	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Nolan	
Gallego	O'Rourke	

## NOT VOTING—4

Cartwright	Lynch	Maloney,
Costa		Carolyn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-

□ 1742

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 68, I was detained off the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 1, noes 421, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—1

Cárdenas

## NOES—421

Aderholt	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Alexander	Castor (FL)	Edwards
Amash	Castro (TX)	Ellison
Amodei	Chabot	Ellmers
Andrews	Chaffetz	Engel
Bachus	Chu	Enyart
Barber	Cicilline	Eshoo
Barletta	Clarke	Esty
Barr	Clay	Farenthold
Barrow (GA)	Cleaver	Farr
Barton	Clyburn	Fattah
Bass	Coffman	Fincher
Beatty	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Becerra	Cole	Fleischmann
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Bentivolio	Collins (NY)	Flores
Bera (CA)	Conaway	Forbes
Bilirakis	Connolly	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Foster
Bishop (NY)	Cook	Fox
Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Black	Cotton	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Courtney	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Cramer	Fudge
Bonamici	Crawford	Gabbard
Bonner	Crenshaw	Gallego
Boustany	Crowley	Garamendi
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Garcia
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gardner
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Garrett
Bridenstine	Daines	Gerlach
Brooks (AL)	Davis (CA)	Gibbs
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Danny	Gibson
Broun (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Gingrey (GA)
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Gohmert
Buchanan	DeGette	Goodlatte
Bucshon	Delaney	Gosar
Burgess	DeLauro	Gowdy
Bustos	DelBene	Granger
Butterfield	Denham	Graves (GA)
Calvert	Dent	Graves (MO)
Camp	DeSantis	Grayson
Campbell	DesJarlais	Green, Al
Cantor	Deutch	Green, Gene
Capito	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Capps	Dingell	Griffith (VA)
Capuano	Doggett	Grijalva
Carson (IN)	Doyle	Grimm
Carter	Duckworth	Guthrie
Cartwright	Duffy	Gutierrez
	Duncan (SC)	Hahn

Hall	McDermott	Ryan (OH)
Hanabusa	McGovern	Ryan (WI)
Hanna	McHenry	Salmon
Harper	McIntyre	Sánchez, Linda
Harris	McKeon	T.
Hartzler	McKinley	Sanchez, Loretta
Hastings (FL)	McMorris	Sarbanes
Hastings (WA)	Rodgers	Scalise
Heck (NV)	McNerney	Schakowsky
Heck (WA)	Meadows	Schiff
Hensarling	Meehan	Schneider
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Schock
Higgins	Meng	Schwartz
Himes	Messer	Schweikert
Hinojosa	Mica	Scott (VA)
Holding	Michaud	Scott, Austin
Holt	Miller (FL)	Scott, David
Honda	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Horsford	Miller, Gary	Serrano
Hoyer	Miller, George	Sessions
Hudson	Moore	Sewell (AL)
Huelskamp	Moran	Shea-Porter
Huffman	Mullin	Sherman
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Shimkus
Hultgren	Murphy (FL)	Shuster
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Hurt	Nadler	Sinema
Israel	Napolitano	Sires
Issa	Neal	Slaughter
Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod	Smith (NE)
Jeffries	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins	Noem	Smith (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Nolan	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Nugent	Southerland
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Speier
Jordan	Nunnelee	Stewart
Joyce	O'Rourke	Stivers
Kaptur	Olson	Stockman
Keating	Owens	Stutzman
Kelly	Palazzo	Swalwell (CA)
Kennedy	Pallone	Takano
Kildee	Pascarella	Terry
Kilmer	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Paulsen	Thompson (MS)
King (IA)	Payne	Thompson (PA)
King (NY)	Pearce	Thornberry
Kingston	Pelosi	Tiberi
Kinzinger (IL)	Perlmutter	Tierney
Kirkpatrick	Perry	Tipton
Kline	Peters (CA)	Titus
Kuster	Peters (MI)	Tonko
Labrador	Peterson	Tsongas
LaMalfa	Petri	Turner
Lamborn	Pingree (ME)	Upton
Lance	Pittenger	Valadao
Langevin	Pitts	Van Hollen
Lankford	Pocan	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Poe (TX)	Veasey
Larson (CT)	Polis	Vela
Latham	Pompeo	Velázquez
Latta	Posey	Visclosky
Lee (CA)	Price (GA)	Wagner
Levin	Price (NC)	Walberg
Lewis	Quigley	Walden
Lipinski	Radel	Walorski
LoBiondo	Rahall	Walz
Loeback	Rangel	Wasserman
Lofgren	Reed	Schultz
Long	Reichert	Waters
Lowenthal	Renacci	Watt
Lowey	Ribble	Waxman
Lucas	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Luetkemeyer	Richmond	Webster (FL)
Lujan Grisham	Rigell	Welch
(NM)	Roby	Wenstrup
Luján, Ben Ray	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
(NM)	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Williams
Maffei	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (FL)
Maloney,	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
Carolyn	Rokita	Wittman
Maloney, Sean	Rooney	Wolf
Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
Marino	Roskam	Woodall
Massie	Ross	Yarmuth
Matheson	Rothfus	Yoder
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Yoho
McCarthy (CA)	Royce	Young (AK)
McCarthy (NY)	Ruiz	Young (FL)
McCauley	Runyan	Young (IN)
McClintock	Ruppersberger	
McColum	Rush	

## NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann	Costa	Lynch
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Markey
Coble	Jones	Schradner

□ 1759

Mr. OLSON changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## HOERBIGER CORPORATION OF AMERICA—50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, April 9, Hoerbiger Corporation of America will celebrate its 50th anniversary. A well-known and highly respected south Florida-based company, Hoerbiger provides many hardworking Americans with high quality manufacturing jobs in our south Florida community.

I commend this innovative corporation for its half decade of business prowess, its commitment to sustainable businesses practices, its fairness to its employees and generosity to our community.

Since 1963, Hoerbiger's focus on quality and innovation has established it as an industry leader, much to the credit of its founder, Hubert Wagner. The legacy of success continues with the expert guidance of its current president, Hannes Hunschofsky.

This exemplary corporation and community partner has accomplished much over the years, and I am pleased that it calls south Florida home. Congratulations to each and every one at Hoerbiger for achieving this exciting milestone, and I wish you many more years of success.

## A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the only way to get our economy growing stronger is to take an honest account of the fiscal problems we face and put forward serious policies to address these challenges—it is called budgeting.

A fundamental part of governing entails writing and passing a budget, something we have not seen from the Senate Chamber in over 4 years. Four years, that's how long my constituents and Americans across this country have had to wait for the Senate to perform its most basic function as a legislative body.

Before today, the only thing certain was that the Senate would not consider a budget. Today, the Senate Democrats introduced a budget, and I'm glad they did. It's about time. Unfortunately, after reviewing their proposal, today the only thing certain is that their budget will never balance.

We owe the American people a responsible, balanced budget. The House

budget introduced yesterday balances the budget in 10 years. The Senate Democrats' proposal never balances—ever.

A balanced budget will foster a healthier economy and create jobs, Madam Speaker. The American people elected us to lead and put forward solutions, not hide from challenges and posture for the next election.

## CONGRATULATING MARS, INCORPORATED

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mars, Incorporated for being recognized by Fortune Magazine as one of the “best companies to work for.”

Many folks are familiar with the Mars' delicious snacks, such as M&Ms and Snickers. In my home State of Georgia, we have come to know Mars as a great place to work through its merger with Wrigley.

Since joining the Mars family in 2008, employees at the Wrigley manufacturing plant in Flowery Branch, Georgia, have benefited from being part of the Mars community. Mars employees are given wonderful opportunities for growth and advancement. As a result, the company boasts a low turnover rate.

Mars' strategies have resulted in diversity that strengthens its business model by mentorship opportunities which are built into the company's structure, including a “reverse internship” in which a younger employee introduces an executive to social media.

Like Wrigley, Mars is truly an American success story. Mars remains a family-owned company that places high value on its human capital, which it demonstrates through significant investment in its 72,000 employees.

Through innovation and creativity, Wrigley continues to identify new markets and growth opportunities, such their new Alert chewing gum line.

I want to congratulate the hardworking Mars workforce throughout the United States, and especially the Wrigley employees in Georgia, for building a great company. The millions of Americans who enjoy Juicy Fruit, Life Savers, and your other wonderful products wish you continued success.

## THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this week, the House Budget Committee chair, PAUL RYAN, laid out his budget plan. Sadly, it's just more of the same. Like a bad

record, this year's Republican proposal is virtually the same document as the one he proposed last spring. It harms the middle class. It harms low-income Americans, and it is especially bad for women and families.

Now they have framed this budget and called it a prosperity one, a prosperity plan. But this budget should be called "the road to austerity," because it is a plan that is most noteworthy for the rather harsh austerity it demands of the many and the lavish benefits it extends to the few. It clearly envisions a rising tide of selective tax cuts that would lift all yachts but leave many dinghies behind.

Our Republican friends like to talk about making the hard choices. What they propose here would indeed make things much harder for millions of Americans, but it will also make things much easier for a fortunate few. That's their plan.

Now, specifically under this plan, he has this new goal of balancing the budget in 10 years. To accomplish this, he slashes funding safety net programs that serve seniors, students, children, low-income families, and women. The budget slashes food stamps and cuts funding for infrastructure investments like high-speed rail. We're falling way behind the rest of the world. We need to invest in our infrastructure to stay competitive. And it does nothing for job creation or to help the unemployed.

The Ryan plan replaces Medicare, and really ends Medicare as we know it by replacing it with a voucher system and replaces Medicaid by making it a block grant to the States. These cuts hurt tens of millions of Americans who count on these programs for their health care coverage.

But not to just rely on what I'm saying, to quote The Washington Post:

The 10-year spending plan released Tuesday by Representative Ryan is virtually identical to last year's GOP budget. It would defund President Obama's health care initiative and guaranteed Medicare coverage for future retirees and sharply restrain spending on the poor, college students and Federal workers.

Now, what I find very hypocritical about this budget is that they say that they are going to repeal ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, yet this bill passed this Congress. It was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had an election where this was the issue that people ran on, and President Obama was reelected, strongly. So they keep flip-flopping on this issue. They say they want to abolish ObamaCare, but then they rely on the savings of over \$700 million in that program.

So when Congressman RYAN was Vice Presidential candidate Ryan, he campaigned against the health care provider cuts of \$716 million, the same ones he wants to keep in this budget. The Republicans opposed these cuts when they were part of the Affordable Care Act, then they passed two budgets that included these cuts. And then Congressman RYAN and Presidential

candidate Romney campaigned against the cuts in the 2012 election. And now Mr. RYAN wants to keep them, once again. That's not just a 180-degree turn, it's 180 degrees times four, so it's a change of 720 degrees.

But one thing that is completely clear in this budget is that women, in particular, will suffer because of the choices the Republican budget makes.

□ 1810

Instead of closing tax loopholes for companies that ship jobs overseas, the budget kicks kids out of Head Start. Instead of getting rid of tax breaks for the oil and gas industry, for single moms struggling to put food on the table it cuts food stamps.

It seems to me with the budget right now that we are spending at a roughly proposed 3.1 percent, but 1.1 percent is tax loopholes. If you just closed those tax loopholes, you would be able to significantly reduce the deficit and the debt. Why in the world are we giving tax loopholes for companies that move jobs overseas? If you're going to give a tax incentive, it should be to the companies that stay in America and create jobs for Americans.

Now, instead of ensuring that women are not discriminated against by health insurance companies, this bill would repeal the rights women earned in the Affordable Care Act. The Republican budget cuts Medicare benefits, cuts Medicaid services, cuts health research funding and so much more all in the name of a new agenda that they have that will cripple our economy and cause real and lasting harm to the women of America.

The Democratic approach is a more balanced one. Everyone agrees that we need to reduce the deficit and cut the debt, but it's a matter of how you do it, what priorities you have in it and what's your timeframe. The Democratic plan is balanced. I would call it a three-legged stool. You have cuts, you have revenues and you have investments to help grow and expand the economy and create jobs, investments in education and innovation.

Chairman Bernanke has testified before Congress that many of the reasons why America is really digging its way out of this recession and bouncing back faster and stronger than Europe is that we have had a balanced approach, whereas Europe has had an austerity, austerity, austerity approach. As many economists say, "You cannot cut your way to prosperity." Austerity needs to be balanced with revenues and also investments.

I'm joined tonight by DINA TITUS from the great State of Nevada. She was reelected in this session. She was an outstanding member of our caucus. We are so thrilled that she's come back to join us.

I yield the gentlelady as much time as she may consume.

Ms. TITUS. Thank you, Congresswoman MALONEY, for letting me join you tonight, and thank you for orga-

nizing this very important special hour to talk about the Republican budget and its unacceptable impact on women.

For the third year in a row, Chairman RYAN has proposed an uncompromising budget plan that is out of touch with my State of Nevada's priorities and the country's vision for the future.

Chairman RYAN has used a lot of gimmicks in his budget, but no amount of chicanery will hide what this budget really means for women.

Instead of laying out a fair and balanced plan, as you said, Congresswoman, Representative RYAN's budget undermines the health and economic security of the elderly and the disabled, most of whom are women, and disproportionately harms low-income women and families they struggle to support.

It also would repeal the Affordable Care Act. This landmark legislation that we passed increases access to critical women's health services such as prenatal and maternity care, and it finally ends the longstanding notion that being a woman is a preexisting condition.

The proposed budget also threatens a laundry list of vital programs that help women and children such as SNAP, WIC, Head Start, school lunches, TANF, and Pell Grants, just to name a few. These are programs that millions of women across the country and their families rely on every day just to get by.

Instead of protecting such critical programs, Representative RYAN and the Republican Party would rather protect tax breaks for the wealthiest folks in our country, for oil companies and for those companies you mentioned that ship our jobs overseas.

The Federal budget is a blueprint for our Nation's future. It's a statement of our national priorities. It should reflect who we are, and it should provide a path forward that we can all be proud of.

My constituents in Las Vegas and our constituents around the country deserve better than this old rehearsed Ryan budget which slashes programs for children, dismantles health care for women, eliminates the safety net for seniors and defunds education and needed research and development that we should be investing in as part of that three-legged stool.

Instead, we need to get to work on a balanced plan that protects women and families and makes those needed investments in our future.

Again, I thank you, Congresswoman MALONEY, and our colleagues who have joined us tonight to talk about these important issues, and I urge you to give careful consideration to the Ryan budget with all those hidden little tricks and old hat policies.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank you for joining us tonight to share how this impacts on Nevada, an important State that you're representing. And I just want to express my gratitude that you have come



back to Congress and that you're a part of our caucus.

Another outstanding woman in our caucus is CAROL SHEA-PORTER from the great State of New Hampshire. And it is a State that's really unusual now in that all of its elected officials are women: the Governor, the legislature, the State and the assembly. We're so pleased that their Congresswoman is here today, and I know she has a special message from the great State of New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I thank you, Congresswoman MALONEY, for the chance to speak about the damage that the Ryan budget would do to women and to families.

There are a couple of points. The new Ryan budget and the cuts to discretionary programs and the cuts to Medicare and Medicaid guarantees would disproportionately affect the women and children who are already suffering this year because of the sequestration.

The Ryan budget would dismantle the SNAP food program just like it does Medicare. About two-thirds of the SNAP benefits go to families with children. They rely on this.

The Ryan budget would roll back affordable health care provisions, bringing back gender-rating and allowing preexisting conditions like pregnancy and domestic violence.

Discretionary spending programs have already seen sequester cuts that will force women and families in need off of programs that help them. The Republican budget would further decimate these programs.

The special supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children, the WIC program, is one of our most successful and essential nutrition programs. Sequester will drop about 600,000 women and children from this program. Under the Republican budget, even more babies and mothers would be kicked off.

The new budget's enormous cuts would do even more than the sequester has done to destroy jobs and hurt our economic recovery. At a time when women are making unprecedented gains in higher education and the workforce, a war on jobs is a war on women and their families.

A budget is a moral document, and the Ryan budget fails this basic test of morality. This is wrong for women, and it is wrong for families, and we just reject this.

I thank you for the chance to talk about it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I appreciate your input and for being here tonight to participate in this Special Order. You've raised some very relevant points.

I want to talk about the special impact the Ryan budget has on the Pell Grant cuts.

One of the ways women try to climb out of poverty and close the pay gap is through education, especially higher education. And as we all know, college tuition has far outpaced inflation for

years and years. That's why programs such as the Pell Grant program are so important. And fully two-thirds of Pell Grant recipients are women.

Yet again, the Ryan Republican budget hurts women college students by cutting nearly \$83 billion—that's with a "b"—from Pell Grants over the next 10 years. They're doing this even though Congress already enacted and paid for annual mandatory inflationary increases in 2010 and recently cut Pell Grant benefits and eligibility to control costs. So the Ryan Republican budget will make it that much harder for women to climb the ladder of opportunity, get a college degree, get a decent job and start or maintain a family. It just does not need to be that way.

□ 1820

As President Obama has said, the math in this Ryan budget does not add up, and the math that is there cuts programs helping working women and single moms. The Ryan budget will be devastating for working women, low-income families and young women trying to afford college. Head Start, early childhood care, food stamps, Pell Grants for college, and so much more would be slashed under this budget. Let's start with early childhood education.

Many researchers and economists tell us that the very best investment that we can make in our society and in our children is in early childhood education. These cuts in the Ryan budget are on top of the \$85 billion from sequestration, which are already in effect. Because of the sequestration, 70,000 children nationwide will be kicked off of Head Start. Another 30,000 low-income children will lose child care assistance because of the cuts to the child care and development block grants. That's a total of 100,000 low-income kids being kicked out of early childhood services. That's already happening as we are speaking tonight on the floor. The Ryan budget would double those cuts, which would mean another 100,000 kids losing services.

What are the working moms of 200,000 children across the country supposed to do? Women only earn 74 cents to the dollar of what men earn in similar jobs. While they are at work, how are these women going to afford to take care of their kids when they lose these services?

The answer is they'll need to find another affordable child care option, which, if you're a mom, you know how difficult that is. Or you'll have to cut back on hours at work because there is no child care. This will only widen the already existing economic divide that separates men and women.

It's not just the economic divide between men and women. The gap between the haves and the have-nots, because of the Ryan budget and the Bush years, has never been greater, but that's not all. Many of these same families would also lose the assistance

they need so that they can feed their families.

Now from the great State of Maryland is the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, ELIJAH CUMMINGS. It's good to hear that like-minded men have joined us in this Special Order on the Ryan budget and how it affects American families.

Thank you for being here.

Mr. CUMMINGS. It's my honor. I want to, first of all, thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank you for calling this Special Order.

As I was listening to you talk, particularly when you talked about Pell Grants and women, I could not help but think about something that you and I hear over and over and over again as we serve together on the Joint Economic Committee. We hear that the less education a person has the more recessionary periods affect them negatively. In other words, if you have a little education, less than a high school education, your chances of being put out of a job or of not having a job are great. If you have a college education, you have a better chance of retaining a job.

You talked a moment ago about women, and women with regard to Pell Grants. Just the other night, I was at Howard University's annual dinner where they were trying to raise money for students to get scholarships. The president of the university got up and said something that was very interesting. He said, We are now having to let young people go who have averages above 3.2 because they don't have the money. I can guarantee you most of those folks were women. He said, when they did the research and looked at young people who had left school years ago and when they just kind of tracked them, they noticed that only about 25 percent ever even returned to school.

What you're talking about is the quality of life for women. So, when you look at the Ryan budget cutting Pell Grants and cutting those things that women are so concerned about—their children and how they're going to be able to raise them, to nurture them, to give them a head start—those things are being cut as if somebody is just going through a forest, cutting down trees with a hatchet. I think that we have to stand up for women. We have to make sure that we let the Nation know what is being done in this budget and make it clear that we're not going to stand for it.

I just want to thank the gentlelady for her presentation tonight and for bringing us together with regard to this very, very important issue.

Keep in mind that he is talking about doing away with the Affordable Care Act. So much of the Affordable Care Act goes to keeping people well—keeping women well, keeping their children well, keeping their families well. It allows them to have affordable and accessible insurance, which is something that women are most concerned about,

and being able to pay comparable rates that men would be paying. I mean, he comes in, and he wants to just do away with the Affordable Care Act and create and give us this budget that really makes no sense.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman for his insight on how this budget is affecting his constituents, and to hear from him that women and men may have an almost perfect score in college and have to leave because they can't afford it, their Pell Grants have been cut—it's just unconscionable that the wealthiest country in the world is not there to invest in the next generation, in the next leaders, the next teachers and engineers that our country needs.

It's not just education. It's not just housing. We're talking about food on the table. Once again, as they did last year, House Republicans are proposing to slash the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. This is commonly called the "food stamps." For people who don't have enough money for their food, this helps them, but they are calling for taking the food stamps and turning it into a block grant. Now, we who have worked in city, State, and Federal Governments know that "block grant" is another way of saying cut—permanently cut—and, in some cases, sliding it out of existence.

SNAP currently helps, roughly, 47 million low-income Americans afford the food they put on the tables every day, and during these past few years of the Great Recession, SNAP has been a lifeline to those in need, making sure that in the wealthiest country in the world American families don't have to go hungry. People who apply for food stamps need food. Now women make up, roughly, 60 percent of SNAP's adult beneficiaries, and more than half of SNAP households with children are headed by a single adult, the vast majority of whom—over 90 percent—are women. That means that single moms on SNAP are already struggling to make ends meet and to take care of their kids.

They will be losing these benefits because the Ryan Republican budget refuses to close the \$1.1 trillion in tax loopholes. Now, I for one say let's close those tax loopholes and keep the food on the tables of America's families who need it. I find that outrageous.

I am really thrilled that a new Member of Congress, LOIS FRANKEL—a woman with a great record of distinction in the State of Florida—has joined us. I want to thank her for coming and providing the perspective of her State. When it's cold, I know all my constituents want to be in Florida, but I'm pleased that she is here with us now.

Thank you for being here.

□ 1830

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Congresswoman MALONEY. I'm pleased to be with you. I came up here as a new Member in a bipartisan spirit, and I really wanted to be standing here

today embracing Mr. RYAN's plan; but I have to tell you, I'm worried about it. And I want to tell you why I'm worried about it. I'm worried about it for Sabrina, for Lucy, for Ruth, Lola, and Barbara.

I'm going to tell you about them. Sabrina is a small business owner. She has a little catering company. She called my office because she's looking for a way to get a small business loan so she can stay in business and improve it. It's hard today getting loans from the banks.

Lucy is a bright-eyed young student in a community college. She is thrilled to have a student loan, a Federal student loan.

Lola is a teacher who has a daughter with cerebral palsy, and she depends on services from the government to help her with her daughter.

And Ruth, Ruth is 91 years old. She used to be a ball of a fire, but she recently hurt herself. She just got out of the hospital, and she can't move around. She can hardly get out of bed. She depends on Meals on Wheels to feed her so she has food every day.

And then there is Barbara who's outlived most of her relatives. She's in a nursing home in my hometown, and she has Alzheimer's.

I know you ask me why I'm worried about them. You know why I'm worried about them, because they are the victims. They will be the victims of this proposed budget. And what's going to happen? Will Sabrina lose her business? Will Lucy have to drop out of school? Will Ruth go hungry? Will Lola have to give up her work so she can stay home with her daughter? Tell me something, who is going to take care of Barbara? Who's going to take care of her?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. No one. No one. She is going to have to quit her job and stay home and take care of Barbara.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Barbara is in no condition to take care of anybody. Listen, I think we all know, the American people know that we have to get our fiscal house in order. There is a deficit problem for us, but the American people want us to solve it in a responsible manner because I also know this: we still have a job problem out there. We have slow economic recovery. And now as we are just turning the corner, all of a sudden we have this plan, this bill, this proposal, this budget that independent analysts tell us is going to throw, what, 2 million people out of work, the majority of them women. It will really crush these people like Lucy, Ruth, and Lola and Barbara and Sabrina. We can tell each other hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of stories.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Thank you for putting a human face on what it's meaning for people who are coming to your office for help. But also what has to be part of this equation is that the economy is still very fragile, and you can't cut your way to prosperity. These deep cuts

could put the economy in a tailspin. Chairman Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, has testified that we need a balanced approach, that we shouldn't slash so severely. Many economists say that the American economy is doing better than Europe because we are not cutting as deeply as Europe is, so giving the economy a chance to recover.

So to go in with these draconian cuts, not only does it hurt people, such as with the stories you're telling us, but it could hurt the recovery, the overall economy that for the past 35 months has been growing private sector jobs and digging ourselves out of that deep recession, so it could possibly throw us back into it. You've raised an important point, and I yield back to you.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I ask another question: What is the logic in taking little children out of Head Start programs when we know that the path to middle class, the path to be able to take care of your family, to take care of yourself, to be a tax-paying citizen is education? So I ask you, Congresswoman, why would we pass a budget that would take 27,000—I think even more, I think the last sequester bill would take 27,000 children out of child care, Head Start, and this new budget doubles down. Why would we do that?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Well, I think you pointed out that this budget is not only draconian and unfair; it is filled with contradictions. Why in the world would you let these tax breaks continue for big oil companies that are making a profit, and we're subsidizing some of them to the tune of 40 percent, yet you're going to take the future of our young kids and throw them off. It is a total, total contradiction; and it's completely wrong.

I want to point out the biggest contradiction in this budget. It repeals the Affordable Care Act, but keeps the law's budget savings and uses it to balance their budget. So they say in the budget they're going to repeal the Affordable Care Act. How are they going to repeal it? It passed the Congress; it is the law of this country. It was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had an election where this was a central point of debate; and, guess what, President Obama won the election, and he ran on the Affordable Care Act. So they say that they're going to repeal it. They don't have the votes to repeal it. And even if they did, he'd veto it. There's no way they can repeal it, so it is a complete—really a hoax. It's a hoax.

Then they claim to protect Medicare while ending Medicare as we know it for future seniors and our children and our grandchildren. And the biggest hoax, they sit there and say they are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and then they take the savings from the Affordable Care Act, the \$718 billion that was put there from the providers, and they use that to balance

their budget. So the numbers do not add up.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Let me ask you this: Does the repeal of the Affordable Care Act come with a repeal of people getting ill? I'm trying to figure out the logic here because if you repeal the Affordable Care Act, if you take Medicare and now you turn it into a voucher program or what they call "premium support," which means literally thousands of dollars more coming out of the seniors' pockets to take care of themselves, you're not repealing illness. All you're doing with this Ryan budget is shifting the burden back to the middle class.

You hit it on the head when you said let's keep giving those tax breaks to the big oil companies, the people who want to move their companies offshore, to big corporations with huge profits paying almost nothing in taxes. Here's how we're going to clean up our fiscal house: we're going to tell people when they're oldest and they're sickest, you're going to have to pay more money, or just don't get sick.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The gentledady is correct. They're shifting the burden onto the middle class, the elderly, and the poor. Again, President Obama's budget contains \$1.3 trillion in spending, and in that budget is \$1.1 trillion in tax breaks. So where are the priorities of this country? Close the tax breaks, keep the food on the table, or close the tax breaks and reduce the deficit.

I think they're not sincere about wanting to reduce the deficit and the debt because if they were, they would take those tax loopholes and close them. Some are important such as the deduction for a family's home. That allows many middle class and moderate middle class Americans to own their own home. They are able to deduct that.

□ 1840

But there are all these other deductions that make no sense. Why in the world are we giving a subsidy to companies that move jobs overseas? It's crazy. If anything, the subsidy should be for companies in America making it in America, creating jobs in America, and paying their taxes, their Social Security, and their Medicare in America.

So this whole budget is an exercise in contradictions and it's an exercise in, really, lack of good judgment or values, and I hope that we are able to defeat it.

I hope that the Democratic plan will be the one that is finally the one that passes. This is just the same old same old from the last 2 years: slash the safety net and protect tax breaks. The Ryan approach just isn't a balanced or, I would say, fair or valued approach.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Representative. I want to thank you for letting me join you here today.

I just want to say this. I know we've been standing up here and we've been critical of this Ryan budget and, re-

spectfully, I think we're just saying it like it is. But I want to just say this, and I know you feel the same way. I hope that we can vet it.

You know, we're venting our feelings here today. And our constituents need to know that we're going to stay strong for them and the women of this country, the Lucys, the Sabrinas, the Barbaras of this country, and of course the men that we love, too. But I hope that we can find a way, that we can find a middle ground, we can find a reasoned budget that gets people back to work, that we secure our families and we get our fiscal house in order in a reasonable amount of time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to thank you, Congresswoman, and you raised some important points.

And one that was not raised, that is the illnesses that we do not have cures for in this country. And one of the things that America's always led the world in is scientific research, yet this budget cuts that research. It cuts the National Institutes of Health that could come up with the cures for the diseases that she mentioned.

America is a place of innovation and medical advancements, and Congress should be focused on keeping that status, that we don't want to lose our leadership in innovation.

To give one example, breast cancer is one of the most common cancers among women. One in seven women will come down with breast cancer, and it is one of the leading causes of death among women of all races in America. In 2009, over 210,000 women in the United States were diagnosed with breast cancer, and over 40,000 women died from the disease.

Over the past 5 years, the National Institutes of Health spent more than \$3 billion on breast cancer research, which dwarfs any amount we see in the private sector or nonprofit sector. And yet, in the Ryan budget, the NIH would be cut and slashed by billions and billions of dollars, yet these dollars are the hope for saving lives. They're the hope for finding cures. And we know that health research has paid off.

Another important area is Alzheimer's. The number of women and men that contract Alzheimer's is huge and growing, and this cut will be cutting the research that we have in Alzheimer's and other lifesaving efforts to prevent Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and other diseases.

So we've been making a lot of progress in health research and innovative research, and all of that research is really at risk under the Ryan Republican budget.

I am very pleased that one of my colleagues from the great State of Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who is a strong advocate for women, children, and families, has joined us. Thank you so much for being here tonight.

I yield the gentledady as much time as she may consume.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my friend from New York, Congress-

woman MALONEY, for her leadership on economic issues particularly impacting women, for the persistence of her introduction of the Equal Rights Amendment, long overdue, that we all join in to ensure the rights of women. And let me thank the gentlemen that are on the floor that joined us this evening.

I want to follow up, as I listened to the discussion that you just had, I met with Dr. Brinkley in the hallway, who is one of the leading researchers in biomolecular research from Baylor University, in my Congressional region, if you will. I consider representation because it is such a massive institution. And he brought with him two of his researchers. In fact, the headline on one of my papers was the standstill work of one of our important researchers because of the sequester, and certainly because of this budget. All of that points to women who are most vulnerable as relates to the needs of research in chronic illnesses.

Let me cite for my colleagues about this question of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security what is drastically cut and reordered under the Ryan Republican budget. I'm really saddened that misinformation comes that the Medicare's predominance, in terms of its help, goes to those who are fat cats.

Let me share some numbers with you. Many of these are women. We do know that women live longer, and so the needs that they have for Medicare and Social Security may be extended.

And may I take something out of our vocabulary, though it is in the dictionary. Medicare and Social Security are earned. I don't know where we got the word "entitlement," because entitlement suggests you're entitled with no basis of responsibility. But they earned this. Women earned this.

And women started before the fight that we had, Congresswoman, for pay equity over the last decade or two. They were making the lower wages, and so their Social Security input had to be much lower as they continued to work years in.

But let me just share with you on the Medicare beneficiaries:

Annual income less than \$22,500: 50 percent of the Medicare beneficiaries include in that number women;

Chronic conditions: of those who receive Medicare, 40 percent include in that number women;

Fair and poor health: 27 percent, women in that population;

Cognitive mental impairment: 23 percent, women in that population;

Functional limitations: 15 percent, women in that calculation.

So, as I look at this budget, 60 percent of it is taking away health care from the poor and middle class, which would include women.

The idea that the bill slants itself toward protecting the interests of the wealthy by not listing any deduction that you're willing to take. Now, I know if we get into a discussion about deductions, we put ourselves in that circle; but let me just say, middle class

Americans need mortgage deductions. I know, however, that that is one that is under discussion.

But why did our friends writing this budget not list the deductions that they would be willing to put on the table? Some of us realize that mortgage deductions help young families. It helps single women. It helps women who are maintaining or getting their first house. So here we have a special emphasis.

I'm glad my colleague mentioned breast cancer. I have introduced legislation on triple negative. It happens to have a far-reaching impact on women from all ethnic groups, whether they are Caucasian, whether they are Hispanic, or whether they are African American or Asian, but it is a deadly form of the disease, a more deadly form of the disease. And so that kind of research which many of us are arguing for is now limited because of this budget.

The budget does not—well, let me just say this. The budget takes for its own what was accomplished with the savings in the Affordable Care Act. It takes for its own the cuts that we made, were willing to make in 2012, over a trillion in cuts and spending. And it totally ignores economists who have indicated that the austerity format that was taken in Europe was the completely wrong direction, and that, then, impacts our families more negatively.

□ 1850

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would be happy to yield.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I want to point out and make sure that our colleagues and the listening public know that the Ryan plan assumes the \$85 billion in sequester cuts. So these cuts are on top of that. And according to the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office, the sequester could cause the U.S. economy to lose 750,000 jobs. And the Ryan plan compounds these job losses.

The Economic Policy Institute has initial estimates that the House Republican budget would cost 2 million jobs in 2014 alone, relative to current policy. So why in the world would we want to take these steps that are going to result in job loss?

I yield back to the lady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady for that astute assessment. When I give these various points, women are disproportionately placed. Many of them are heads of households, many of them are senior women. Many are going back into the workforce because they have resource shortages, if you will. And the Ryan budget takes in all of these; i.e., the \$85 billion in sequester cuts. By the way, again, I introduced legislation to eliminate the sequester provision out of the Budget Reconciliation Act. I happen to think that it is meritorious because we need

to start from a fair point of view, not what I call nickel and diming, ending people's research, closing doors in the Capitol, and a number of other things that are not good for America.

But let me just finish on this. If we're interested in R&D, as we indicated, or clean energy—slashed. Obviously, it will have an impact on the quality of life of families who are raising their children. What about nutrition assistance, the SNAP program? What an obliterating cut to the SNAP program, which is now serving 48 million people. Let me remind my colleagues that these are military persons, women who are in the military. These are young families. These are individuals who are in school. And so women are disproportionately impacted.

And this, I think, is clearly one of the largest conflicts of reason, and that is to underfund or take away the funding for the Affordable Care Act, which has been reaffirmed by the United States Supreme Court and has been documented as having a health care savings and providing for a healthier America. And here we are taking away coverage from 27 million Americans.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. They take away the good aspects of it, all the preventive and the health care. They propose to eliminate that, but then they keep the tax savings from it to balance their budget. It is a hoax. It's not realistic. It's not true. And I really appreciate your words here today on the floor.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. They take all the good things that, might I say, the Democrats have worked on and can really be defined as balanced and fair and utilize it in a budget that is absolutely lopsided. And I thank you for having us on the floor to explain to the women of America why this budget will not be good for them, their children, or their expanded families, and that we're committed to standing against this kind of approach that is really not the American way.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady.

In conclusion, Americans can't afford more fuzzy math and budget gimmicks. We need real solutions that help grow our economy, create jobs, support the health and economic security of our seniors, and one that will address the arbitrary sequester cuts. Chairman RYAN's budget fails to address any of these.

Our Republican friends like to talk about making the hard choices. What they propose here would indeed make things much harder for millions of Americans, but it will also make things much easier for a fortunate few. That's their plan. The reality is that the majority's Ryan budget harms those who need help and doles out tax breaks and benefits to those who do not. So let me be as clear as I possibly can: the Ryan budget, if it were passed by the House, would risk our recovery.

I want to thank all the participants tonight. I thank the like-minded men

who came to the floor to support us and the women that have spoken out tonight on how the budget affects women, children, and their expanded families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 803, SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFE-LONG SKILLS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-16) on the resolution (H. Res. 113) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### FIREARMS TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for 30 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with us and pass the bipartisan legislation to strengthen Federal penalties for straw purchasing of firearms. I'm a hunter and a gun owner, and I believe strongly in the Second Amendment. I support law-abiding Americans' right to own firearms, and nothing in this legislation infringes upon that right. This bill simply helps keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals who cannot legally buy guns on their own.

I chair the House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force. Our task force has developed a comprehensive set of policy principles that will help reduce gun violence. To develop these principles, we met with virtually everyone who had an interest on this issue: Republicans, Democrats, the NRA, gun owners and gun safety groups, mental health experts, educational leaders, people from the video game and movie industries, hunting and sportsman's groups, law enforcement leaders, and the Vice President of the United States. Out of these meetings, one of the principles we developed dealt specifically with strengthening penalties

for gun trafficking and for straw purchasing. This is something we should all be able to agree on.

At a hearing yesterday held by my colleague and friend, Mr. CUMMINGS from Maryland, and one of his cosponsors, Mrs. MALONEY from New York, we heard testimony from New York City fireman Ted Scardino. Mr. Scardino was wounded and two of his fellow firemen were killed when a gunman lured them to a house that that gunman had set on fire and then started shooting at them. The shooter had his neighbor buy the gun for him because he could not pass a background check.

Mr. Scardino said yesterday:

Putting a gun in someone's hand that isn't supposed to have one must be stopped.

So let's pass this bipartisan bill and let's stop it.

I now yield to my colleague and good friend from Maryland, the author of this legislation and a leader on this issue, Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today to ask every Member of the House to join our bipartisan efforts to combat firearms trafficking and cosponsor H.R. 452, the Gun Trafficking Prevention Act.

Earlier this year, I was honored to join colleagues on both sides of the aisle to introduce this commonsense proposal to make firearms trafficking a Federal crime for the first time and to impose stiff new penalties on straw purchasers. Since then, the number of cosponsors has swelled, adding both Republicans and Democrats. It has also gained bipartisan support in the Senate.

Our bill has been endorsed by law enforcement officials across the country, and it does not affect the rights of any law-abiding gun owner. The only people that would be against this bill would be straw purchasers and those who are forbidden legally from possessing a gun.

Just yesterday, we held a bipartisan forum, as my colleague has just mentioned, to hear the accounts of first responders who have been the victims of gun violence resulting from straw purchases or other trafficking incidents.

□ 1900

I want to reiterate what has been said by Mr. THOMPSON about Ted Scardino. He was a brave firefighter from New York who suffered multiple gunshot wounds and saw two of his colleagues gunned down on Christmas Eve when they were responding to a fire. Mike Chiapperini and Tomasz Kaczowka were those colleagues who are now no longer with us. Here is Tomasz. He was just a 19-year-old who had just joined the volunteer fire department.

It turned out that the fire was set by a convicted felon, William Spengler. He previously served 17 years in prison for killing his grandmother with a hammer. Spengler ambushed these first responders and sprayed them with bul-

lets. Despite his criminal record, Spengler walked into a gun store, alongside a straw purchaser, to obtain guns to be used to kill these brave men. As Mr. Scardino said yesterday, he supports our bipartisan legislation because he wants to keep guns out of the hands of deranged killers, create a deterrent to providing guns to dangerous criminals, and prevent more tragic deaths like these.

After working on this legislation for several years, Mrs. MALONEY and I have never been more hopeful that we can pass it with significant bipartisan support. I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON, just very briefly, one of the things that has been said over and over again—and we hear it from the NRA—is that we ought to deal with the laws that we already have. Well, right now, there's a phenomenal loophole with the laws that we already have.

Law enforcement, by the way, brought this to the attention of our committee, and they didn't ask for a trafficking law—they begged for it. Because as was testified to yesterday in the hearing, those who want to commit some kind of crimes, they're always looking for what they call a hustle; they're looking for something to make their money off of.

Witnesses told us yesterday—as a matter of fact, the head of the San Francisco police said that it has become easier to deal in guns and more lucrative than to deal in drugs. So a lot of folks that would normally be going to deal in drugs are now dealing in guns. Why? Because there is no dedicated trafficking law, and this is what our bill will do. It also will increase those penalties for straw purchasers.

I want to thank the gentleman, by the way, for your hard work. You've done an outstanding job in bringing Members of the House together to forge ahead with regard to legislation to address these issues, and I want to thank you.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

I appreciate the fact that you provide clarity on the one issue, and that is that the critics of anything we try and do to prevent gun violence repeatedly state, Just enforce the laws that are on the books. Here, this gun trafficking proposal that you and Mrs. MALONEY have introduced is, I think, illustrative of the fact that sometimes you actually need other laws. Because there are no laws on the books to prevent against something that leads to the tragedies that we heard about in your hearing yesterday and that, sadly, the folks in this New York area and the families of these slain individuals will have to live with for the rest of their life.

I can't emphasize enough: there is no dedicated law on the book that prohibits trafficking of guns. People are trafficking in guns, and they are used to kill people. We have an opportunity,

and I commend you and Mrs. MALONEY for not only your dedication and your effort to bring this to an end, but the fact that you've reached out across party lines. You have a bipartisan coalition; you have bipartisan authorship of this bill recognizing that we've got to bring this to a stop.

The only sad commentary that I have is one of our brave colleagues who was willing to stand up and take a position on this bill to prevent criminals from getting guns, has been under attack by some who have just mischaracterized his position, mischaracterized his dedication, mischaracterized his motives, and mischaracterized the bill that all of you are working so hard on.

So thank you for being here tonight, And thank you very much for your tireless effort in bringing closure to this issue.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you very much.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I would now like to yield to my friend and colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Thank you so much for organizing this.

I want to thank my dear friend and colleague, MIKE THOMPSON, not only for his leadership here on the floor, but the great work that he has done as the leader of the House Democratic Gun Violence Prevention Task Force. One of the things that he underscores at all of our hearings and meetings is that he is himself a gun owner. He enjoys hunting; he enjoys having a gun for protection; he enjoys it for target shooting. But he also understands that certain guns are not for hunting; they're just for killing people, such as assault weapons, and that there are loopholes in our laws.

I regret to inform you tonight that there has been another mass murder in New York yesterday, where a gunman shot down four law enforcement in upstate New York. Now, if we don't make changes, we can only expect more of the same. It was only 10 days after the tragic killing of 20 young innocent children in Connecticut that the tragedy happened in upstate New York.

Now, the straw purchaser that bought the guns—the rifle and the assault weapon—for the felon that murdered two police officers and firemen, I doubt that that neighbor would have bought those guns for him if the law had been on the books that straw purchasers could be looking at 20 years for knowingly buying guns and giving them to a criminal or a person who could not legally have that gun.

Now, this bill has been endorsed by 30 different law enforcement organizations. Law enforcement is asking us to give them the tools to get illegal guns out of the hands of criminals. This bill that I authored grew out of a hearing we were having on violence on the border of Mexico. The agents testified that guns were being shipped into Mexico that were then used to kill our border

agents. So I asked the question: Why don't we just stop the guns? At that point, the agents testified that they don't even bother to bring charges against straw purchasers because the laws are so weak. They call them a "slap on the wrist," a paper violation, that you wouldn't be punished at all.

So what we're trying to do with this bill is to make trafficking in guns to felons, to drug cartels, to gang leaders a crime—it's unbelievable that it's not a crime now—and to increase the penalties for the straw purchasers. I think it's reasonable, it's common sense, and, fundamentally, it will save lives in our country. It was introduced with Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. RIGELL. Mr. RIGELL is a member of the NRA. Also, I think that Mr. MEEHAN was also a former leader in law enforcement, so he had really literally understood the need of it.

At our hearing yesterday—and at the hearings we've had in the Government Reform and Oversight Committee—law enforcement is basically begging us, absolutely begging us to give them the tools to better protect Americans.

I hope that we will listen to our chairman's plea, MIKE THOMPSON's plea, that at least on this we can come together and forge a bipartisan effort to pass these two important bills. So I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentlelady for her dedication, for her hard work on this, and for her taking time to be here tonight to talk about this.

You raised the issue and praised those on the other side of the aisle, many of whom have experience—one Member from Virginia, who is an NRA member, one from Pennsylvania, who is, I believe, a district attorney; extensive law enforcement background.

□ 1910

It's important that we have this type of across-the-aisle cooperation. As a matter of fact, the people of the United States of America, every one of us hears it every time we go home—we hear it in our townhall meetings, we can read it in our constituent mail, our friends tell us, our neighbors tell us: work together to solve the problems that we all face as Americans.

The fact that we have folks on the other side of the aisle coming forward to work together and then they're demonized and they're criticized for doing this, all Americans need to speak out against this. When something like this happens, we need to let everyone know that, no, we want our Members of Congress to work together to solve these problems that threaten our communities, threaten our children, threaten our grandchildren, and threaten our neighborhoods. It's very, very important to do that.

As the gentlewoman pointed out, I am a gun owner and I hunt, and I believe strongly in the Second Amendment. I'm not interested in giving my guns up, and I'm not going to ask any

other law-abiding citizen to give their guns up. At the same time, I'm a father and I'm a grandfather, and my kids and my children deserve to live in a safe community. Two of my sons are first responders. One is a firefighter; another one is a deputy sheriff.

When I sat through your hearing yesterday and listened to the testimony of the wounded firefighter talk about his colleagues who were killed—called to respond to a community catastrophe, a house on fire—doing their job, doing what we ask these first responders to do—and they get there and they're ambushed by a sick deranged murderer who has a gun because somebody bought it for him, because it was illegal for him to buy it himself, he couldn't buy it himself. It was just terrible to relive this for the witnesses who were there and certainly eye opening for anyone who paid attention to what the possibilities are out there in any of our communities.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield time to a new Member of our House—someone who has been doing outstanding work, vice-chair of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, someone who brought with her not only an interest and a passion for this, but also an incredible constituency, because it was in her district that Sandy Hook took place—the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Thank you so much, Congressman THOMPSON, for organizing this Special Order and for your incredible leadership on these important issues that the country deserves to have a voice and deserves to have a vote.

And I wanted to thank Congressman CUMMINGS and Congresswoman MALONEY for your important leadership on this very important issue that is truly a remarkable hole in the law that I think most people had no idea.

These are the holes that we saw yesterday, because the holes in the law are allowing holes in the hearts of the families of America. Holes like this, shot with assault weapons, to brave firefighters who were responding to a fire on Christmas Eve, that's what this really means.

This is a 19-year-old young man following in his family's footsteps and his lifelong dream to be a firefighter and instead was met with this, and that ended his life—a man who never should have had those guns.

Yesterday, I had the pleasure of welcoming to Washington Team 26, a group of 26 cyclists from the town of Newtown, Connecticut, in my district, who rode to Washington in support of commonsense legislation to reduce and prevent gun violence. The Sandy Hook ride to Washington was a successful event. It was also emblematic of what we're seeing across the country in the wake of the tragedy in Newtown.

Americans have been touched by the strength and love of the families and the people in Newtown in a way we have not seen in this country before. I

can assure you, the Connecticut effect is not going away anytime soon because the American people are stepping up and making their voices heard for commonsense, reasonable regulations and laws to reduce and prevent gun violence. For far too long, for far too long, communities across this country, like West Webster, New York, and like Newtown, Connecticut, have paid for the price of inaction here in Congress. We cannot keep losing precious children and courageous police officers and brave first responders and many other innocent lives because we have allowed, and we are allowing, guns to be put into the hands of people who do not have permission and do not have the right to have them.

It is shocking and it is wrong that we do not have vigorous Federal laws making straw purchasing and trafficking in guns a Federal crime. We've learned today, and we learned yesterday in our hearing, that it is against the law to traffic in drugs, it is against the law to traffic in tainted food, but it is not against our Federal laws to traffic in illegal weapons in this country, and that is wrong and we need to fix it.

That's the reason that the Gun Trafficking Prevention Act has bipartisan support in the House. That is the same reason that this measure has the strong support and backing and urging and pleading of the hardworking law enforcement officers in my State who are dealing with the consequences of illegal drugs, including the leadership of Connecticut Attorney General and my friend George Jepsen.

There's a reason that law enforcement officials and groups around the country have been asking for us to pass this law. Few policies reflect commonsense, like keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals. If we are going to accomplish that goal, we must address this gaping hole with the lack of Federal laws punishing gun trafficking and straw purchasing.

Now is the time to act. We have a real opportunity to enact and to fix this hole in the law and to prevent holes in the hearts of the American people. I'm very proud to be a cosponsor of the Gun Trafficking Prevention Act and the Straw Purchaser Penalty Enhancement Act to do just that.

For the families of Newtown, for families across this great country who are affected by gun violence, for children and for police officers and first responders everywhere who put their lives on the line for us every day, and for all those whose lives are at risk today because of illegal guns, let's meet the call of the American people to strengthen the penalties for gun trafficking and straw purchasing.

I urge my colleagues to support this very laudable legislation, and I urge members of the public to urge their Representatives to stand up for safety for our first responders for our communities.

I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding.



Mr. THOMPSON of California. Thank you, Congresswoman ESTY, and thank you for your work on the task force and for your work every day to make sure that we all come together to make our communities safer places to live, to work, to recreate, and to raise our families.

One of the things, one of the beautiful benefits of doing this work for me has been the honor I've had in not only working with great dedicated people, yourself included, but meeting some of your wonderful constituents. Their passion is on fire in Connecticut. I've met with them many times with you, sometimes alone. We got another glimpse of it yesterday, as you mentioned, when Team 26 rode into Washington, D.C., rode all the way from your district to Washington, D.C., to call on all of us to work together to pass these bills to make our communities safer. They're wonderful folks, they're dedicated, they're hard-working, and I can understand why after watching you and experiencing your leadership on this issue. So thank you very much for all that you are doing.

And I just want to remind folks that the American people want us to make our communities safer; they want us to pass sensible laws that will do this. And everyone will tell you we shouldn't allow criminals and the dangerously mentally ill to get firearms.

Well, how in the world can you do that if you don't do some just real commonsense steps to make sure that doesn't happen?

We're talking about a couple of them today—straw purchases and gun trafficking.

□ 1920

Who in the world could be opposed to stopping straw purchases? And that means just what it says. That means somebody buys a gun and gives it to somebody who's not allowed by law to own a gun, who is trafficking in guns, making a living, making a profit, making a business out of buying guns and then shipping them someplace, taking them someplace, introducing them to a community where they're going to be used for unlawful purposes. No one could possibly be against that.

Background checks is another one. As you know, our task force will be holding a hearing this Friday on background checks. Ninety-four percent of the American people believe we should pass background checks. Eighty-four percent of the NRA members think we should pass a background check bill. We're going to have an opportunity next week when I introduce legislation to put in place background checks for the American people to call their Representatives and let them know. This is important stuff. We need to have that check in place so people who are dangerously mentally ill, people who are criminals, if they try and buy a gun from someone selling that gun, it will be flagged if they're not allowed to have them and they'll be stopped, at least in that case. They may try and

find other ways to do it, but it's incumbent upon us to do everything we can to make sure that that doesn't happen again.

I'm now going to yield to my friend and colleague, the vice chair of the task force, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank you for yielding, and most of all I thank you for your leadership in the firearms task force, the prevention of gun violence.

You've done a tremendous job in bringing diverse views into focus to respond appropriately to the children who were murdered senselessly in Newtown, Connecticut. They were young people, babies, whose bodies were riddled with bullets. I think finally we have concluded that we have to do something in response to the murders.

One of the things we have to do is reduce violence generally—and violence prevention. This week I'll be introducing the Youth PROMISE Act, which has a proactive approach to make sure that young people get on the right track and stay on the right track.

We have to deal, as you have indicated, with the mental health challenges. Those with mental health challenges have to get services, because if they're allowed to roam the streets with untreated mental health problems, you have a lot of difficulties.

There have to be some firearm-specific situations, such as an assault weapons ban, limiting the size of magazines, background checks, but also straw purchases, people who buy firearms for others knowing they could not buy them for themselves. Violating the law and circumventing the good background check processes we have has to be dealt with.

So I thank you for your leadership. I thank you for all that you have done. We have a lot that we can do in response to Newtown, and we expect to do it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for being here tonight and for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I'll end where I started. As I said, we have to come together to work on these issues. These are the issues that the American people want us to find solutions for. Let's close these loopholes, make sure that illegal gun activity doesn't take place, and protect the Second Amendment. You know I'm four-square on that, and we'll do everything we can to make sure that that happens. These are commonsense issues, and we should find cooperation across the aisle.

As I said, I'll end where I started. I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join together and to pass these bills that both protect our Second Amendment rights and help make our communities safer places in which to live, work, play, and raise our families.

Madam Speaker, thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

671. A letter from the Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [CPCLO Order No.: 001-2013] received February 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

672. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1070; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-17340; AD 2013-03-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

673. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0098; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-039-AD; Amendment 39-17339; AD 2013-03-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

674. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1110; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-013-AD; Amendment No.: 39-17353; AD 2013-03-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

675. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1005; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-27-AD; Amendment 39-17349; AD 2013-03-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

676. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines and Continental Motors, Inc. Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1245; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-41-AD; Amendment 39-17279; AD 2012-24-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

677. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0339; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-051-AD; Amendment 39-17259; AD 2012-23-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

678. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0590; Directorate Identifier

2011-NM-112-AD; Amendment 39-17265; AD 2012-23-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

679. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Univair Aircraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0360; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-061-AD; Amendment 39-17023; AD 2012-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

680. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1056; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-17271; AD 2012-24-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

681. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0186; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-286-AD; Amendment 39-17278; AD 2012-24-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

682. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1206; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17269; AD 2012-23-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

683. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0421; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-042-AD; Amendment 39-17284; AD 2012-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

684. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0678; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-285-AD; Amendment 39-17280; AD 2012-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

685. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc., Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0746; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-332-AD; Amendment 39-17337; AD 2013-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

686. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0547; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-234-AD; Amendment 39-17354; AD 2013-03-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

687. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0595; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-055-AD; Amendment 39-17962; AD 2012-23-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

688. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0591; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-015-AD; Amendment 39-17264; AD 2012-23-08] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

689. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1220; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-208-AD; Amendment 39-17277; AD 2012-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

690. A letter from the Department of Transportation Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation Paralegal Specialist, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Schweizer Aircraft Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0602; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-061-AD; Amendment 39-17338; AD 2013-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOX. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 113. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century (Rept. 113-16). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 1104. A bill to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURT (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 1105. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to provide a registration exemption for private equity fund advisers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. CHU, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1106. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide for in-

creased limitations on leverage for multiple licenses under common control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 1107. A bill to provide for the establishment of a grant program to assist State and local governments to install solar energy systems; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VELA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 1108. A bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1109. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require cost or price to the Federal Government be given at least equal importance as technical or other criteria in evaluating competitive proposals for defense contracts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FALCOMA, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 1110. A bill to amend the Tsunami Warning and Education Act to direct the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, through the National Weather Service, to establish, maintain, and operate an additional tsunami forecast and warning center for the improvement of the evaluation of tsunami risk to, and the dissemination of forecasts and tsunami warning bulletins for, the public in Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a 500 percent excise tax on corporate contributions to political committees and on corporate expenditures on political advocacy campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1112. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its reporting requirements to require public companies to report certain expenditures made to influence public opinion on any matter other than the promotion of the company's products or services; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1113. A bill to make the antitrust laws applicable to a political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 which is established and administered by a separate segregated fund of a corporation pursuant to section 316(b)(2)(C) of such Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1114. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend the ban on the making of contributions by certain government contractors to other for-profit recipients of Federal funds, to limit the amount of contributions the employees of for-profit recipients of Federal funds may make during any calendar year in which such funds are provided, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1115. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit any national securities exchange from effecting any

transaction in a security issued by a corporation unless the corporation's registration with the exchange includes a certification that the corporation currently is in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 governing contributions and expenditures by corporations which were in effect with respect to elections held during 2008; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1116. A bill to require the approval of a majority of a public company's shareholders for any expenditure by that company to influence public opinion on matters not related to the company's products or services; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1117. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations in which foreign principals have an ownership interest; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1118. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit corporations which employ or retain registered lobbyists from making expenditures or disbursements for electioneering communications under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1119. A bill to prevent funding provided through the Federal Reserve System from being made available to corporations that finance political campaigns or political propaganda, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself,

Mr. KLINE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 1120. A bill to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from taking any action that requires a quorum of the members of the Board until such time as Board constituting a quorum shall have been confirmed by the Senate, the Supreme Court issues a decision on the constitutionality of the appointments to the Board made in January 2012, or the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 113th Congress; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1121. A bill to protect cyber privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HALL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 1122. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to prohibit Federal

education funding for elementary schools and secondary schools that provide on-campus access to abortion providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATT, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1123. A bill to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. NEGRETTE McLEOD, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SIRE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WATT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 1124. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for the TIGER Discretionary Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1126. A bill to facilitate the completion of an appropriate national memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1127. A bill to require the President to develop a comprehensive national manufacturing strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1128. A bill to ensure the effectiveness of the missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1129. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MENG, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LATTI, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. YODER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BARBER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 1130. A bill to authorize further assistance to Israel for the Iron Dome anti-missile defense system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 1131. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges, without time-period limitation, to members of the Armed Forces who are involuntarily separated with a service-connected disability and also to extend such privileges to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1132. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to jointly ensure that the Vet Centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs have access to the Defense Personnel Record Image Retrieval system and the Veterans Affairs/Department of Defense Identity Repository system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1133. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 1134. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a grant program and pilot program designed to improve the delivery of health care to veterans residing in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 1135. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to repeal certain additional disclosure requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr.

DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1136. A bill to amend the Hate Crime Statistics Act to include crimes against the homeless; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1137. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to conduct a Joint Venture Program to protect, restore, enhance, and manage migratory bird populations, their habitats, and the ecosystems they rely on, through voluntary actions on public and private lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 1138. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a loan guarantee program to assist small business concerns that manufacture clean energy technologies in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1139. A bill to permit aliens who lawfully enter the United States on valid visas as nonimmigrant elementary and secondary school students to attend public schools in the United States for longer than 1 year if such aliens reimburse the local educational agency that administers the school for the full, unsubsidized per capita cost of providing education at such school for the period of the alien's attendance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1140. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the medical expenses of dependents who have not attained age 27 to be paid from a health savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1141. A bill to amend section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that any hours worked by Federal firefighters under a qualified trade-of-time arrangement shall be excluded for purposes of determinations relating to overtime pay; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 1142. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit an exchange of land between the city of Ketchum and the Blaine County School District, Idaho; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 1143. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require the Bureau of Prisons to provide secure storage areas on institution grounds outside the secure perimeter for employees authorized to carry a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 1144. A bill to restore an opportunity for tribal economic development on terms that are equal and fair, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1145. A bill to help ensure the fiscal solvency of the FHA mortgage insurance

programs of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 1146. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1147. A bill to provide limitations on maritime liens on fishing permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. REED, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARTON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MESSER, Mr. RADEL, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LONG, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. HUNTER):

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the conditions for the United States becoming a signatory to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, or to any similar agreement on the

arms trade; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 112. A resolution celebrating the history of municipal bonds, the 100-year precedent of the Federal tax exemption for municipal bond interest, and the important contribution municipal bonds have made to economic growth and wellbeing in each State and municipality in our great Nation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. VELA, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H. Res. 114. A resolution recognizing the Sabin Vaccine Institute on the 20th anniversary of its founding; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 115. A resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirtieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H. Res. 116. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 13 as "K-9 Veterans Day", in order to recognize the service and improve the treatment of military working dogs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 1105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution permits the Congress to, "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes"

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 1107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 1108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8: Powers of Congress Clause 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GRAYSON:  
H.R. 1109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. PIERLUISI:  
H.R. 1110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:  
H.R. 1111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAYSON:  
H.R. 1112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAYSON:  
H.R. 1113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAYSON:  
H.R. 1114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAYSON:  
H.R. 1115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAYSON:  
H.R. 1116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAYSON:  
H.R. 1117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 gives Congress the authority "To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." This legislation addresses the rights granted by Congress to selected copyrighted works.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 1128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. The Congress shall have the power to . . . make rules for the Government and Regulation of land and naval Forces . . . To make all laws this shall be necessary and proper. . . .

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 1129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 1131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 1132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. GALLEGOS:

H.R. 1134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8:

POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 1135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 1142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article N, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 1143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

"The Congress shall have Power. . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 1144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

AND

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8

The Congress shall have Power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

H.R. 25: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 35: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 36: Mr. FLORES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 52: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 55: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 155: Mr. BONNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 164: Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 171: Mr. ENYART, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 176: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MICA, and Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 183: Mr. CLAY and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 196: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 198: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 207: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 258: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 285: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 311: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 333: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 335: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 351: Mr. BARROW of Georgia and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 358: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 360: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FARR, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 361: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 401: Ms. ESTY, Mr. YODER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 411: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 447: Mr. MESSER and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 454: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 481: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 485: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 486: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 487: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 540: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 541: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 544: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 569: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 570: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. COLE

H.R. 581: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 582: Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. RADEL, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 584: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 604: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 611: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 627: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr.

DESJARLAIS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CULBERSON, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 628: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 630: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 633: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 634: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 647: Ms. DELAULO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 659: Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 661: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 669: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 676: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 683: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 688: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 690: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 693: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 719: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 721: Mr. REED, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 722: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 724: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 725: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 729: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 732: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BUCHSHON, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 736: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 742: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 755: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 763: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COLE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YODER and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 769: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 776: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 782: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 794: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 811: Mr. REED.

H.R. 819: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 825: Mr. BUCHSHON.

H.R. 826: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 828: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 833: Mr. PERRY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. STEWARD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 850: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. McKEON, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 877: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 892: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 896: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 900: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. MASSIE.



H.R. 903: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YODER, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 904: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 916: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 940: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KLINE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 956: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 958: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 961: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 973: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 979: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 981: Mr. HOLT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 996: Mr. OWENS, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1003: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1005: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1008: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1014: Mr. BARR and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1025: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1026: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1032: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1039: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LONG, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1089: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1090: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1102: Ms. NORTON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.J. Res. 21: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.J. Res. 26: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. ROKITA.

H.J. Res. 34: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 36: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H. Res. 69: Mr. BENISHEK and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.

H. Res. 74: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 80: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 86: Mr. OLSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 87: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 90: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. NEAL.

H. Res. 94: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 95: Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 101: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 108: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 110: Mr. VARGAS.